

The Bible Champion

Volume XVIII.

DECEMBER, 1914.

Number 5

THE ARENA

The First Man

PROF. L. T. TOWNSEND, LL.D.

Part First.

HOW MAN DID NOT ORIGINATE.

First Paper.

Man is now on the earth, but how, or when in time, he got here; and how or when, he began to reason, talk and walk as men do now, are questions that have occasioned in the scientific world no inconsiderable discussion and have resulted in various theories. It will not be wide of the mark, however, to say, they all may be reduced to three, provided there is allowed for each a fair measure of latitude.

1. The first theory is, that the lowest forms of life, originated by what is called spontaneous generation, a perfectly normal production and that the higher forms, including man, were in every case evolved by natural processes from those that were inferior.

This is what may be termed materialistic or naturalistic evolution and from our point of view is the only logical and self-consistent theory of the origin of living things and of man that has yet been proposed, if there is eliminated from the discussion the theory revealed in the writings of the Sacred Scriptures.

Naturalistic Evolutionists of the radical type, accordingly rule God out of the universe. The claim being that nature is not only abundantly able to look after herself and all things committed to her care, but actually does this, independent of any outside, or Super-normal or Supernatural interposition.

This theory, as is well known, was made popular by Mr. Darwin, elaborated in Germany by Professor Haeckel, and in England was ably defended by Professor George J. Romanes, whom Professor

Haeckel once declared to be the ablest psychologist in the world.

2. The second theory, one in which we place no more confidence than in Mr. Darwin's views, is this: that all living things including man, have been evolved by natural processes (those of Mr. Darwin, Prof. Haeckel and Prof. Romanes), but have been under the control of an infinite Creator.

If, therefore, from the moneron, or from the original lump of albumen, endowed with life and potency, have come all living things, then, according to this theory, whatever struggles for existence, survivals of the fittest, use or disuse of organs there have been, or whatever leaps from one species to another in the processes of development, have taken place, the active and potent agent has been an infinite, ever present intelligent and Super-normal Ruler, whom civilized people call God.

3. The third theory as to the origin of things, including the human race, is the one clearly revealed in the Sacred Scriptures and is in manifest opposition to both atheistic and theistic evolution.

It would seem therefore, that the discussion may be narrowed to this limitation. If it can be proved that living things were not some how supernaturally created, then some how they were evolved from start to finish by natural processes. If, on the other hand, it can be proved that they have not been evolved by natural processes, then, somehow they were Supernaturally created. There is no alternative as was clearly shown by Professor Romanes in his book *Darwin and After Darwin*.

In passing, we may say a few words in historic review of both atheistic and theistic evolution. Hints of evolutionary theories are well on in years. Anaximander forbade the eating of fish for the reason that fish is the father and mother of man. Buechner commends the Indian for calling the wolf his brother. A theory of evolution was measurably formulated by Aristotle (350 B. C.) St. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas were also among evolutionary pioneers. They taught that there is a first and a constantly superintending Cause; they allowed interventions and interruptions, likewise the occasional production of new creations, and in that way filled existing gaps.

Later, Bishop Butler stated the doctrine of evolution somewhat indirectly thus:

"Men are impatient and for precipitating things; but the Author of nature appears deliberate throughout his operations, accomplishing his natural ends by slow, successive steps. And there is a plan of things beforehand laid out, which, from the nature of it, requires various systems of means, as well as length of time, in order to the carrying-on its several parts into execution."

Sir John Herschel in his various studies, is found in sympathy with evolution; his chief objection to those who hold evolution in its extreme form was, that they do not sufficiently take into account, "the continually guiding and controlling agency of a divine Intelligence."

Pope's *Essay on Man* likewise contains a rather complete system of mundane evolution.

John Wesley, whose masterly mind is more acknowledged as the years go by, was an evolutionist from some points of view almost as pronounced as Mr. Darwin.

"Wesley believed that there was a regular graduation of creation, from the amælucle to the archangel—'an opinion' says Southey, 'confirmed by science as far as our physiological knowledge extends.' He also thought it probable that each class in the series advances, and will forever advance, men taking the rank of angels, and brutes the rank of men, and eternal progress to be the lot of all sacred beings." (Stevens's *History of Methodism*.)

The theory of derivation or descent, was set on foot by Goethe (1790), and by Erasmus Darwin, the grandfather of Charles,

(1794), and was clearly announced by George Louis Leclerc Buffon (1707-1788). That which was original with the elder Darwin was his theory of natural selection, by which all forms of life, by inherent powers determined their successors and ever since have maintained a continuity of development from lower to higher.

Lamarck in his *Vestiges of Natural History of Creation* (1844), gave a new impulse to scientific research and set the world to thinking vigorously on evolutionary lines. His claim was, that "the species are derived one from another through the ordinary channels of inheritance, being unceasingly moulded under the pressure of surrounding conditions." He went so far as to claim that environment reacts upon the form and constitution of living things to such extent that if a dry climate became sufficiently wet, its animals will after a while become aquatic, be web-footed and develop flippers.

It may therefore be said that Lamarck and not Darwin was the originator of Darwinism. There are those who place Lamarck in advance of Darwin from several points of view. In *The Revue Scientific*, Paris, 1909, Professor Delaye speaks thus in praise of Lamarck:

"But let us say very clearly that human thought has never surmounted the barriers of routine and prejudice, never raised itself higher into the serene realms of the True and the Beautiful, by a more sublime effort, than when the idea of transformism sprang from the brain of Lamarck."

Though ancient philosophers, church fathers and scientists, for many centuries had thought and spoken on evolution, the subject did not gain its majorities, or make what has been termed "its conquest of the world," until Alfred Wallace and Charles Darwin, in 1858, separately announced the hypothesis of the Origin of the Species by spontaneous variation, and the survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence. And whatever other names are spoken, that of Mr. Charles Darwin, among evolutionists, stands out most prominently. His *Origin of Species* (1859) with the subtitle, *The Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life*, is still held to be the most masterly discussion of the theory of descent by the gradual

transformation of Species through natural selection, that has as yet been written. The first edition of his book was exhausted on the day of its publication. Few if any scientific works have had wider circulation. Upon continuity in Nature's processes was based his strongest argument against special or fiat Creation. With rare judgment and astonishing patience, he developed almost a new system of observation and never perhaps in the entire history of science or philosophy has such a pronounced revolution in thought and opinion been effected as in the twelve years 1859 to 1871. Up to the commencement of that period, the belief in the creation or origin of animals and plants, and the very recent appearance of man on earth were, with the few exceptions mentioned, the accredited beliefs.

For a while after Mr. Darwin's views were published there was no little hesitation in adopting them; yet later the theory was so generally accepted in Germany, England and America that for one to have questioned it, in the main, any time during a period of twenty years or more, beginning near 1880, would have been generally regarded as evidence of an unphilosophic, unscientific and unscholarly mind.

The distinguished naturalist Gaston Bonnier, in a recent book *Pour et Contre Le Darwinisme* (Paris), gives this fair and discriminating estimate of Mr. Darwin and his writings:

"Darwin was a savant in the strict sense of the word. He was a profoundly original philosopher a shrewd observer, superficial, but of surprising ingenuity. He was first of all a charmer. Even when his statements lack precision, there is an inexpressible pleasure in reading him. Moreover, 'his work was done at a time when naturalists seemed tired of piling up facts without tracing the relations between them.' They welcomed his '*Origin of Species*' enthusiastically. It stimulated their zeal, gave their investigation a purpose. And then both his disciples and his adversaries went beyond him."

This also should be said, that notwithstanding Mr. Darwin's naturalism he never published a word against Christianity, nor against clergymen, though often bitterly assailed by the pulpit. In early life he was orthodox and always gave evidence of a

character in every way above reproach. His intention when a student at Cambridge was to fit himself for the Christian ministry. But the scientific field appeared the more attractive and gradually and rather hesitatingly he became an agnostic. He did not care to speak on distinctively religious subjects. He once wrote: "I do not feel that I have thought deeply enough on religious subjects to justify any publicity." Some of his other sayings are suggestive and will always be of interest: "I was unwilling to give up my belief." "The whole subject of theology is beyond the calibre of the human intellect; but man can do his duty." "I do not attack Moses, and I think Moses can take care of himself." "I am like a man who has become colorblind. My mind seems to have become a kind of machine, for grinding general laws out of a large collection of facts."

In early life he had a fondness for music, pictures and poetry as well as for things religious. But devotion and consecration to scientific research robbed these subjects of all attractiveness and interest. For this deprivation he was not without regrets: "The loss of these tastes," he once confessed, "is a loss of happiness, may possibly be injurious to the intellect, and more probably to the moral character, by enfeebling the emotional part of our nature."

With becoming modesty, in a letter to Dr. Joseph Leidy (1859), he wrote thus:

"I have never for a moment doubted that though I cannot see my errors, that much in my book (*Origin of Species*) will be pronounced erroneous."

A few facts as to theistic evolution, in view of our attitude toward it, should be stated:

At a time when the Scientific world had almost completely surrendered to Darwinism, it is not surprising that an adjustment was sought by theologians, between that theory and the Bible record. The adjustment as we have seen, was attempted by admitting the Creator into the scheme of evolution. It was thought that by allowing him to remain on the throne and allowing Naturalistic Evolution to be His

method of creating and peopling the earth, that the conflict between Modern Science and Bible Revelation would be brought to a peaceful issue. It was thought by not a few that this device of substituting Creation by evolution, for Creation by fiat was in the realms of Science and Philosophy, a remarkable triumph.

The real point of the difficulty in the minds of many Christian Scholars was this, that the views of Mr. Darwin were so firmly entrenched that they could not be questioned, much less successfully assailed, therefore a reconciliation of some sort was an absolute necessity.

Men of high standing are therefore found in the ranks of theistic evolutionists. Verrill, Mivert, Owen, Lotze, Sir Oliver Lodge, Drummond and others in Great Britain and in America, Dr. M'Cosh, Joseph Cook, John Fisk and others, while holding the theory of evolution, left God on the throne.

Among theistic evolutionists there are those who are self-consistent enough to contend, or at least suggest, that the original life germs fall within the scope of processes no less naturalistic than those that work out the development of all forms of living things.

A professor in Wesleyan University, who assuredly would resent being classed among atheists, in a book recently published states the case thus:

"When we trace a continuous evolution from the nebula to the dawn of life and again a continuous evolution from the dawn of life to the varied fauna and flora of to-day, crowned with glory in the appearance of man himself, we can hardly fail to accept the suggestion that the transition from the lifeless to the living was itself a process of evolution."

This conclusion is logically sound, if the premises are correct; that is, if the unaided forces of nature have really evolved from structureless germs the beautiful organisms and mechanisms everywhere met, then those same forces ought to be able, in nature's wonderful laboratory, to manufacture the original germs from which those complex living things are developed.

A few quotations will clear this part of the subject from misunderstanding.

Says Dr. J. W. Dawson:

"The term 'evolution' need not in itself be a bugbear on theological grounds. The Bible writers would, I presume, have no objection to it if understood to mean the development of the plans of the Creator in nature. That kind of evolution to which they would object and to which enlightened reason also objects, is the spontaneous evolution of nothing into atoms and force, and of these into all the wonderful and complicated plan of nature, without any guiding mind."

The statement of Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace is this:

"The inference I would draw from this class of phenomena is, that a Superior Intelligence has guided the development of man in a definite direction and for a special purpose, just as a man guides the development of many animal and vegetable forms."

Dr. M'Cosh in his *Reply to Tyndall* employs these words:

"Two great scientific truths have been established in this Century. One is the doctrine of the conservation of energy. . . . The other is that of development, not dreamed of till the researches of Darwin were published. We may however discern a plan and purpose, means and end in the way in which plants and animals are evolved,—which are evidently not by chance."

Professor Asa Gray, who defended Darwin against many hostile attacks, states his opinion thus:

"Wherefore we may insist that, for all that appears, the argument for design, as presented by the natural theologians is just as good now, if we accept Darwin's theory, as it was before that theory was promulgated."

Canon Kingsley voiced the views of a large number of devout thinkers in these words:

"I have gradually learned to see that it is just as noble a conception of Deity to believe that He created primal forms capable of self-development into all forms useful for time and place, as to believe that He required a fresh act of intervention to supply the gaps which He himself had made. I question whether the former be not the loftier thought. Let us rather look with calmness and even with hope and goodwill on these new theories: they surely mark a tendency toward a more, not a less, scriptural view of nature. Of old it was said by Him, without whom nothing is made, 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.' Shall we quarrel with Science if she should show how these words are true? What, in

one word, should we have to say but this: "We know of old that God was so wise that he could make all things, but behold he is so much wiser than even that, that he can make all things make themselves?"

Professor Stanley Jevons states his position thus:

"I cannot for a moment admit that the theory of evolution will alter our theological ideas. . . . The precise reason why we have a backbone, two hands with opposable thumbs, an erect stature, a complex brain, about two hundred and twenty-three bones, and many other peculiarities, is only to be found in the original act of creation. I do not any less than Paley believe that the eye of man manifests design. I believe that the eye was gradually developed but the ultimate result must have been contained in the aggregate of causes, and these so far as we can see, were subject to the arbitrary choice of the Creator."

It appears therefore that biologically, naturalistic and theistic evolutionists are in agreement to this extent,—that both may use in common the terms "Natural Selection," "Struggles for Existence,"

TEN YEARS IN ADVANCE.

"It is said that when Rome was besieged by the Carthaginians, and many feared The Eternal City was on the verge of ruin, an auction was held for the sale of the land on which the Carthaginians were encamped. It was sold for a fabulous sum to the highest bidder after an eager contest. When the Carthaginians heard of it, they lost heart and Rome was saved.

"I do not believe many Periodicals can boast of a ten years' subscription paid in advance. I do not know what inspired you to do it. It came at a time when I was ill, over-worked, with little hope of immediate relief in help. I was driven to the utmost of time and strength to carry the work of my great Church and the CHAMPION at the same time. You will be glad to know that your generous act put new courage into heart and mind. I secured immediately one of the largest Churches in Greater New York for a Bible Conference. I am now working up the Program. It will be the beginning of a stirring campaign to bring to this Metropolis a know-

"Survival of the Fittest," and "Transmutation of Species."

But notwithstanding all this, we are constrained to say, that while theistic evolutionists are possibly entitled to our thanks for their apologetic efforts to reconcile Bible theology with Naturalistic Evolution, still we are quite sure they have attempted an impossibility, for no naturalistic conception of the Universe ever can harmonize with the Bible account of the beginning of things. Either Creation of the different species by the fiat of an Almighty Creator or their Creation by spontaneous generation and Naturalistic Evolution must be accepted. These two masters cannot be served. If one is chosen the other must be left.

3. The third theory as to the origin and development of living things is purely theistic. What this term implies will appear further on in the discussion.

(To be continued.)

ledge of their obligation and duty toward God's Word. I thank you a thousand times."

Letter to a subscriber who renewed his subscription and paid for *ten years in advance*. If every subscriber possessed as great faith and showed like interest according to their means, a nation-wide campaign with THE CHAMPION would begin in an hour. Who will be the next to make One Hundred, or One Thousand?

THE BIBLE CHAMPION is what its name suggests—a defender of the old Book. Jay Benson Hamilton, the editor, is a brilliant and prolific writer. Its contributions are capable and scholarly. Its appeal is to the popular mind, and it brings each month a mass of material usable by any public teacher, and especially adapted to the popular mind. This magazine is successor to the stalwart *Bible Student and Teacher*, and it is an improvement even on that much-appreciated journal.—*Christian Standard*.

The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch

REV. JOHN H. RAVEN, D.D.*

I.

The question before us is the difference between a capital and a small letter.* All Bible students believe in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Some of them spell mosaic with a capital M as the adjective derived from the proper name Moses. Thereby they express their belief in the old traditional view that the first five books of the Bible were written by Moses, the great Lawgiver of Israel. It is not contrary to this position to admit (1) that Moses made use of earlier documents and oral traditions in composing the book of Genesis which relate to events before his time; nor to admit (2) that the last chapter of Deuteronomy which contains the account of Moses' death was added by a later hand, possibly by his successor, Joshua; nor yet to admit (3) that after Moses' time the Pentateuch may have undergone such slight changes as the modernizing of a few names of places. With these necessary exceptions, the conservative critics believe that Moses was the author of these books. Other critics of a totally different type spell mosaic with a small m. They affirm that the Pentateuch and Joshua, which together they call the Hexateuch, were composed by several schools of writers living from four to eight centuries after Moses' time and that the work of these schools of writers was pieced together at different times by two or more redactors or editors. This modern theory originated with a French physician, Jean Astruc by name, who in 1753 advanced the idea that in writing Genesis, Moses used two older documents characterized by the two principal Hebrew names of the deity—Elohim, rendered God in our English Bibles, and Jehovah, rendered Lord with capital letters in the Authorized and English Revised Versions. Let it be noted that Astruc applied this theory only to the book of Genesis and did not deny that Moses was the author, or perhaps we should say edi-

tor, of that book. It was after Astruc's day that this principle was applied to the entire Pentateuch and that the documents were made post-Mosaic. The eminent German scholar, J. G. Eichhorn (1782), adopted Astruc's divisive principle, retaining however the Mosaic authorship. This earliest form is called the document hypothesis. The clue to the partition of the books being given, the hypothesis has taken several forms since that day. Thus Vater (1805) advanced the idea that the Pentateuch is composed of thirty or more fragments altogether independent of each other. This view was in a sense a logical result of the original principle, but it did not find favor for long. It gave place to the supplement hypothesis—that the Elohistic document was complete and was used by the Jehovahist as the basis of the present Pentateuch. This conception, advocated by De Wette and others, accounts for the relative completeness of the Elohist and fragmentariness of the Jehovahist and does away with the necessity of a redactor. Just as the original document hypothesis was carried further by the fragment hypothesis, so this new supplement hypothesis eventuated in the so-called crystallization hypothesis, of which Hupfeld and Ewald were the chief advocates. They asserted that there were many supplementers and Hupfeld in particular distinguished two writers who used the name Elohim. This crystallization hypothesis gave way before the modified document hypothesis of which the principal author was Wellhausen, in his "Prolegomena to the History of Israel" which appeared in 1878. Since in its main features it is still the dominant form of the theory, its conception of the formation of the Pentateuch may be briefly described as follows: The oldest document is the Jehovahist, commonly called J. It originated in the Kingdom of Judah about 850 B. C., that is, from four to five centuries after Moses. Its author or authors were prophets, and their conception of God was anthropomorphic and their historical de-

*Professor of Old Testament Languages and Exegesis, New Brunswick (N. J.) Theological Seminary. Read before the New York Methodist Ministers' Meeting, October 26, 1914.

scriptions vivid and naive. About fifty years later the second Elohistic document, called E, arose in the Northern Kingdom. After the fall of the Northern Kingdom in 722 B. C. and before 639 B. C. when Josiah came to the throne, J and E, having been more or less revised and enlarged, were combined by a redactor, commonly called R, into a single document, and circulated in this way until their incorporation in the Pentateuch. This is called JE. The third Pentateuchal document in order of age is the Deuteronomist called D who composed the main portion of the book of Deuteronomy. This is the book which was discovered in the temple in 621 B. C. and was the basis of the reforms of King Josiah. Some critics regard it as a pious fraud of Hilkiah and Shaphan, the priests, to secure the sanction of Moses' great name for the reforms desired, while others admit that part of it may have been handed down from Moses himself and that it was revised in the reign of Manasseh. Many critics believe that D was combined with JE by a redactor early in the Exile, whom they call R 2. The fourth but most important document was P, written by priestly author or authors in Palestine shortly before 450 B. C. This document uses the name Elohim, from which fact it was sometimes called the first Elohist. It is the basal document in Genesis, including, besides many of the patriarchal stories, genealogies, and the greater parts of Exodus and Numbers and all of Leviticus. Chapters xvii.-xxvi. of Leviticus are called H, or the Law of Holiness, and are regarded as much older than the remainder of P, possibly older even than J. Not long after the composition of P the final redactor, called by some R 2 and by others R 3, arranged the Pentateuch in its present form. He used P as the basal document for the historical sections, at times inserting only those parts of J which he deemed necessary for the completeness of the narrative. Sometimes an entire paragraph is the work of one writer. Then again a single verse or sentence may contain phrases from J and P or J and E, or in Deuteronomy JE and D. Besides this the various redactors occasionally inserted explanations or additions of their own. Such is the Wellhausen hypothesis in its

main outlines. The more radical of the Wellhausen school regard P JE and D as schools of writers and claim to be able to divide P into P 1, P 2, etc., and J into J 1, J 2, J 3, etc. More conservative critics, on the other hand, hesitate at these extremes, and although they consider J E as a composite document, they regard the separation of J and E as a far more precarious matter than the separation of P from J E. It should be remarked that each document contains a code of law. In J E it is Exodus xx.-xxiii., sometimes called the book of the covenant; in D it is Deut. xii.-xxvi.; and in P it is the priestly legislation in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers. These so-called codes of laws are related to that found in the book of Ezekiel. It is the corner-stone of Wellhausen's hypothesis that the legislation was a gradual evolutionary process culminating in P after the Exile. A few critics, however, place P before the Exile, and hence before Ezekiel which is based upon it. As we contemplate the theory in its entirety, it need only be added that it inverts the order of the Old Testament. It places the law after the prophets, in particular the priestly writing after the prophetic writing. Indeed, it regards the Old Testament as the result of a synthesis which followed after an antithesis between the prophetic and priestly schools. Nearly all the Old Testament literature is divided between prophetic and priestly writers and the entire canon has been worked through laboriously to separate them from each other.

Let us take up the critical arguments and weigh them one by one:

(1) The oldest argument is the use of the divine names, Jehovah and Elohim. It is a fact that sometimes an entire paragraph will use one of these names only and the following paragraph will use the other. There is a tendency, however, among recent radical critics to put less and less confidence in this criterion by itself. This is altogether natural for two reasons: (a) the use of the divine names is no help at all in distinguishing P from E, since both use the name Elohim; (b) it is a common thing to find Elohim in J sections (Gen. vii. 9; xxxiii. 5, 1, etc.), and Jehovah in P sections (Gen. vi. 16; xiv. 22; xvii. 1; xx. 18; Ex. xviii. sometimes). In such cases the advocates of the

theory assert that the redactor changed the name or that it was changed by some copyist by mistake. Thus, basing the theory on the Pentateuch as we have it, the divisive critics are frequently compelled to alter the text to make it fit the theory. This is so frequent as to suggest the question whether the trouble lies with the text or the theory, which is said to be based upon it. The fear is aroused lest the text be regarded as so unreliable that the theory has no ground to stand upon. Furthermore, it is not asserted that J did not know the name Elohim nor that P and E did not know the name Jehovah—only that it was the habit of P and E to use Elohim and the habit of J to use Jehovah. The theory offers no explanation of the question, why one of the writers adheres to one name and the other to the other name. It ignores the etymology and proper usage of the names entirely. All this is clear if the Pentateuch is the work of one author. P is said to be cold, formal, monotonous; but it is just in such connections that we would expect the name Elohim, the general name of God without special reference to Israel. J is naive and anthropomorphic in his idea of God; here again in such connections we would expect the name Jehovah. On this subject the late Dr. William H. Green of Princeton wrote: "The divisive hypothesis can give no reason why the Elohist rather than the Jehovahist should have given an account of the creation of the world and all that it contains; nor why the Jehovahist rather than the Elohist should have described the beginnings of God's earthly kingdom in man's primeval condition and the mercy shown him after his fall; nor why the Elohist never speaks of an altar, or sacrifice or invocation or any act of patriarchal worship; nor why Elohim regularly occurs when Gentiles are concerned, unless special reference is made to the God of the patriarchs. All this is purely accidental on the divisive hypothesis. But such evident adaptation is not the work of chance. It can only result from the intelligent employment of the divine names in accordance with their proper meaning and recognized usage." (Unity of Genesis, pp. 347-8.)

There is one passage which requires special treatment because of the use made of it

by the divisive critics to support their theory. That is Exod. vi. 3, where God said to Moses: "I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty (El Shaddai), but by my name Jehovah was I not known unto them." This is regarded as the work of P, and it is affirmed that P could not have written these words if he had been the author of all of Genesis, for the name Jehovah occurs often in Genesis even in the mouths of the patriarchs themselves. All this looks very plausible, but it is really based upon a misinterpretation of Exod. vi. 3. When God said to Moses, "By my name Jehovah was I not known unto them," he did not affirm that Jehovah was an unknown name to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but that the full revelation to be associated with the name from Moses' time and onward had not yet been given to the patriarchs. This is the almost uniform usage of the expression "to know the name of Jehovah," throughout the Old Testament. One or two passages must suffice to show this. The Psalmist says: "They that know thy name will put their trust in thee" (Ps. ix. 10); "Because he hath set his love upon me, therefore will I deliver him: I will set him on high because he hath known my name" (Ps. xci. 14). And Isaiah records God's words: "Therefore my people shall know my name: therefore they shall know in that day that I am he that doth speak: behold it is I" (Isa. lii. 6). Such also is the usage in the passage before us. God had revealed himself to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as El Shaddai, God Almighty. They knew the name Jehovah, but its full significance was not yet revealed to them. By the covenant at Sinai God would make that name new and glorious in the sight of Moses and all Israel.

Before leaving the subject of the divine names, let me add that by the exigencies of the divisive theory the criterion of the divine names fails. They say that P uses Elohim uniformly before Exod. vi. 3, but Jehovah and Elohim indiscriminately after that verse. But if so, the later portions of P cannot be distinguished from either J or E by this criterion.

(2) The second argument for the division lies in the alleged distinct vocabulary of each one of the Pentateuchal documents.

The way this is determined is somewhat as follows: The divisive critics examined the first chapter of Genesis, the so-called P account of creation, and made a list of its characteristic words and phrases. They did the same thing for the so-called parallel account of creation in Genesis ii. by J. With this start, they examined the next set of parallels, thus enlarging the list of characteristic words of each document. So step by step they continued the process through the five books of the Pentateuch and Joshua until a long list of words and phrases belonging respectively to P, E, J and D was secured. The divisive critics display these long lists of words as indisputable proof that the documents came from different hands. On this argument several things need to be said:

(A) The argument has no force unless the alleged P word or expression is paralleled by a synonymous word or expression in J, or vice versa. If J had no occasion to express the idea, of course no argument can be based upon his not using the word. This principle reduces very considerably the long lists of words with which the divisive critics try to overawe their opponents. Only those remain in each list which correspond to synonyms in one or more of the others.

(B) With regard to these synonyms, the same principle holds which we have already used concerning the divine names, viz., that synonyms are not exact equivalents, but only similar; that furthermore it is quite natural for a writer to use one word in one connection and a synonym in another connection. For example, P and D use a certain form of the word to beget, meaning literally "he caused to bring forth," while J uses a simpler form rendered "he begat." The probable reason for this is that P and D contain the formal genealogies where the more exact and formal expression is appropriate. As the language of legal documents differs from that of ordinary correspondence, so that of P differs from that of J and E.

(C) There still remain a few forms and phrases which the previous principles do not explain. One of the most important of these because so common is the personal pronoun "I." In Hebrew this takes two forms. The shorter one is almost uniformly

found in P and the longer one in D, while J E uses both. With regard to this and similar parallels let me revert to what was said in the beginning about the possibility that Moses made use of earlier documents in compiling the book of Genesis. This book records matters long before Moses' time. While God could have revealed these things directly to Moses, such is not his usual method when man can obtain the facts by natural means. It is far more probable that the tradition was preserved orally until the time of Abraham, who almost certainly could write, and that from his time the material was committed to writing which ultimately came down into Egypt and was preserved until the time of Moses. But if such was the case, it would account for some of the alleged parallels and alternate forms in Genesis. Moses had his own ways of speaking, which are reflected in the later books of the Pentateuch which are not based upon pre-Mosaic documents. We cannot affirm positively that this is the correct explanation of the matter. The times of Moses are so far removed from us that we cannot state with certainty the exact impression produced by such words as the two forms of the pronoun "I." Perhaps it was customary to use one of them in some connections and the other in other connections, somewhat as we use "thou" and "thee" in prayer but "you" in ordinary conversation. At any rate, the facts do not warrant the conclusion that different documents run through the Hexateuch.

(D) Only one more remark is appropriate concerning the alleged vocabularies of the documents. Since the work of analysis begins in Genesis it goes through more smoothly there than in the later books. The list of words characteristic of each document being shorter in the earlier stages of the analysis, the number of exceptions is necessarily smaller. Yet even in Genesis as we proceed there are more and more instances where J words occur in P passages and P words occur in J passages. Here the theorist is forced to call the redactor to his aid and say that he changed the word or to lay the blame on some copyist of the Hebrew text. The instances of this are not so numerous in Genesis to be serious, but

as the analysis proceeds and the lists of P, J, E and D words and phrases lengthen, the divisive critics are compelled to resort to the redactor more and more and to every conceivable expedient to account for the increasing number of exceptions, until in Joshua the analysis is confusion worse confounded. There is really no reason why the process of learning the different vocabularies should not begin with Joshua and proceed with the books in the inverse order. If this were done the analysis of Joshua would be the easiest, and the greatest difficulties would present themselves in Genesis, for whichever order is taken the difficulties inevitably multiply as we proceed, until the analysis breaks down by its own weight.

(3) The third argument for the analysis is the affirmation that there are parallel accounts of the same event such as two accounts of creation, two of the flood, three accounts of patriarchs lying about their wives in foreign countries, etc. These parallels are said to contradict each other at many points. Of course we cannot go into great detail in this matter for lack of time. A few principles and examples must suffice.

(A) Several of the alleged parallels are not parallels at all. Thus Gen. ii, does not contain an account of creation parallel in any sense to that in chapter 1. Chapter 1 gives a systematic and orderly account of creation culminating in the creation of man in the divine image. Chapter 2 deals with the creation of man and the garden of Eden in which he was placed in detail and from a totally different standpoint, enlarging upon a single feature of chapter 1, but nowhere contradicting it. In other cases the alleged parallels are accounts of different, but similar events. Thus in Gen. xii. 10-20 J records how Abram went into Egypt and lyingly said to Pharaoh that Sarah was his sister. In Gen. xx. 1-18 E records that Abraham lied about Sarah at Gerar for the same reason. In Gen. xxvi. 5-11 J says that Isaac lied about his wife Rebekah at Gerar. Now the divisive critics say that here are three varying traditions of the same story. J is not sure whether Abraham was the hero of the story or Isaac. He is also uncertain

whether it happened at Gerar or in Egypt. E on the other hand is sure it happened in Gerar. Now why in the name of common sense can we not see here three different events similar in some details. If Abraham lied about Sarah to Pharaoh, why couldn't he do it again for the same purpose to the king of Gerar and why couldn't Isaac with his father's evil example before him commit the same sin in the same place after the king of Gerar had forgotten the trick or perhaps another king was on the throne? J evidently thought that Abraham did it twice. Hence we must subdivide J to account for both of these. If Abraham did it twice, why could not Isaac do it once?

Many instances of far more remarkable parallels are found in history outside of the Bible. Thus there were two theologians, named Jonathan Edwards. Dr. Samuel Miller of Princeton, says: "The son greatly resembled his venerable father in metaphysical acuteness, in ardent piety and in the purest exemplariness of Christian deportment." The article in McClintock & Strong's Cyclopedias on the younger Edwards concludes with these words: "The son like the father was a tutor in the college where he had been a student; was first ordained over a prominent church in the town where his maternal grandfather had been pastor; was dismissed on account of his doctrinal opinions; was afterwards the minister of a retired parish; was then president of a college and died soon after his inauguration. His memoir states that both the father and the son preached on the first Sabbath of the January preceding their deaths from the text: 'This year thou shalt die.' Such truly wonderful parallels in modern life should make us hesitate to deny the possibility of genuine parallels in the Pentateuch.

(B) Other alleged parallels are forced upon the text by dividing and subdividing a consistent and orderly account. A good example of this is the story of the flood. The P account of the flood reads quite smoothly although it omits several important details supplied in the intervening J sections. The J account however, is so fragmentary that it does not deserve to be called an account of the flood at all. It

needs for completeness the very items which P contains. Now these facts cause some of the critics to say that the redactor included only those items from J which are not sufficiently explained in P. This would be plausible if the very same critics did not point out other matters in which P and J are said to be irreconcilable. The fact is that almost any piece of literature can be divided into two or more parts more or less complete by the principles of the divisive criticism. As a *reductio ad absurdum* Dr. Green divided the parables of the prodigal son and of the good Samaritan into two parts. Dr. C. M. Mead of Hartford Seminary did the same thing for the Epistle to the Romans under the pseudonym E. D. McRealsham. An ingenious higher critic can divide an average newspaper account into two or three accounts. One of them will usually be more complete than the others. Omit the details and assign them to another writer. Although these details may not read very smoothly by themselves this is sufficiently explained on the theory of a redactor who omitted at times statements which are already given in the basal document.

(C) The alleged contradictions of the parallel accounts are not nearly as formidable as they appear at first. Thus the statement of Gen. vii.12 ("The rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights")

A FRANK WARNING.

Editors of The Presbyterian:

I had it in my plan to remember Princeton University very handsomely, but if the present liberal tendency is continued, there will be nothing coming.

Pennsylvanian.

This writer is frank and fair. There have been enough of Christian offerings placed upon the heathen altar, enough Christian foundations laid for heathen superstructure. This mixture is a failure. The German giants have sent a heathen blast across the deck of the century, and it has silenced the poor little fellows who for decades have been trying to unite faith and infidelity. Nothing remains but a square conflict between heathenism and Christianity. The whole earth is summoned to the decision: If Christ be God, worship

does not contradict the statement of Gen. vii.24 ("the waters prevailed upon the earth a hundred and fifty days"). Any fair minded reader would understand that it rained forty days while the flood lasted 150 days. The rain was not the only nor the principal cause of the flood. Not only were the windows of heaven opened but the fountains of the great deep were opened up. Again there is no contradiction concerning the name of Isaac meaning laughter. Both his father and his mother laughed in doubt when his birth was foretold and his mother laughed for joy after he was born. These statements are neither mutually exclusive nor contradictory. Once more there is no contradiction between the statement that Joseph was sold into Egypt by Ishmaelites (Gen. xxxvii. 25-27, xxxix. 1.) and the statement that his purchasers were Midianites (Gen. xxxvii. 28, 36). These statements do not conflict any more than it would conflict to say that Woodrow Wilson is a Virginian and again that he is an American. In Judges vii. 8, is recorded the battle of Gideon against the Midianites but in viii. 24 is the remark: "They had golden earrings because they were Ishmaelites." Apparently the term Ishmaelite was the broader one which included the Midianites.

(To be continued.)

him. If Thor or some other be god, worship him. Compromise is out of date. The men and institutions of America can no longer resist the summons. It is the Almighty who calls. We cannot serve God and mammon, we cannot worship Christ and Belial. To profess to honor and study the Bible, and then to tear it to pieces is puerile and offensive; to claim the Spirit of Christ and deny his substance is farcical and hypocritical. The call is "to stand and having done all, to stand."

We introduce to our *What Not* an Editorial from the *Presbyterian*. We join in the call "to stand, and having done all, to stand."

The advance in subscription of all subscribers for one year would lift our burden and insure our future. Do it now!

The Virgin Birth and the Divinity of Jesus

H. W. MAGOUN, PH.D.

Third Paper.

Personality appears to be a simple thing. That it is not, however, is shown by the diverse views entertained by different persons concerning the same individual. Each sees him from his own standpoint, and each has his own opinion of him in consequence. A man's reputation is made up of these conflicting views, as a sort of composite photograph, and it is therefore never altogether reliable. In spite of that fact, it constitutes, in a general way, a picture of a man's personality as his fellows see him. His own opinion of himself always differs from this, and it may be taken as the basis for a second personality. But his actual character, as God knows it, is unlike either of these, and that furnishes a third or true personality. Paul recognized this peculiarity in himself (1 Cor. iv. 1 f.), and it exists in the case of every man and every woman.

The important thing, however, is not the act itself, but what lies back of it. Ex-President Fairchild of Oberlin was the personification of benevolence, as was universally recognized, and yet, on one occasion, in a faculty meeting, a rebellious and impudent student so aroused his righteous indignation that he walked up to him and spoke a few words with such astonishing sternness that even the college professors trembled with awe. It is said that some of them actually trembled, and more than one of those present received a suggestion of that sort of an experience it might be for a sinner to be faced by his rejected Redeemer sitting in judgment. Here was a strange personality manifested in a wholly unexpected way by a well-known educator. It made a tremendous impression, but the man's real personality included sternness as well as benevolence, and the contradiction was only apparent.

It sometimes happens that the same man may appear at one moment as a cruel monster and at another as a most tender and affectionate parent. Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde have their counterpart in real life; if it had not been so, Stevenson's book

would never have been written. It would have been a travesty too glaring for general acceptance. Double lives are all too common in our great cities, and they postulate, on the part of those who live them, a sort of dual personality. Under the influence of hypnotism, dual personalities are often revealed in the subjects treated, and scientists have been much puzzled by the fact. In rare cases, a third personality has been brought to light by the successive stages of hypnotic influence, and some have actually tried to explain the matter by resorting to the pagan idea of reincarnation and previous states of existence, which they suppose are recalled in hypnosis.

While conclusions of that sort are altogether too radical to be accepted, this much is probably true. Every man exhibits at times the personality of his mother, in one way or another, although his father's peculiarities may be more conspicuous in his ordinary conduct. This gives him, in a sense, two personalities. But a third, his own, dominates both of these and determines not only which of them shall have the larger influence in his daily conduct, but also what sort of a man he shall be. Any one who will carefully study life, as he or she has experienced it, will be able to trace each of the three personalities in his own particular case. If his father and mother were of unlike temperament, he may seem to be a bundle of contradictions, but in the end the choices which he individually makes from day to day will determine his character and his destiny.

Every man has within him an ideal toward which he is inclined at times to strive. But he likewise has evil tendencies within him, and he sometimes finds himself doing what he would not and unable to do what he would. Paul states it in one way and Plato in another. Each of them, however, recognizes the facts and each states them effectively. Plato's figure of the white horse and the dark at variance with each other (Phaedr. 253 f.)

means the same thing in the last analysis as Paul's plain statement of fact. Plato places the final responsibility in the hands of the charioteer, but the charioteer is only a figurative representation of the dominating personality, or the individual will, which determines the final course taken by the horses.

Man's personality, then, as well as man himself, is hopelessly complex. In him, body, soul, and spirit are combined together to form a trinity. In his mind, intellect, sensibility, and will are united to form another. In his personality, his father's features and characteristics are commingled with those of his mother, while his own choices dominate both and mould them to his will. The ultimate result is a sort of threefold personality, or trinity of characteristics and qualities. Some men seem to differentiate themselves into two persons, after a fashion, and they then talk to themselves as to a chum. Those much alone easily form the habit. Under proper conditions, men have also actually observed themselves doing something; and the act has become an impersonal one, so far as they were concerned, some one else was doing it, as the matter appeared to them during the process.

In their sleep men sometimes do things and have no knowledge of the occurrence, either at the time or afterward, unless informed of it or made aware of it by some tangible evidence left behind them. They likewise gain the power to work out difficult problems or actually do work them out in their sleeping hours, and the sub-conscious self, so called, gets the credit for the performance. What is that subconscious self? Concerning it, the philosophy called New Thought has much to say, and many are wondering how far such teachings can be tenable. It is not the conscious personality of the waking hours. That much is clear. And whatever it is, it, or something else, does accomplish most of the things claimed for it. Is it the real self? Is it the dominating personality, as it appears in the regnant will, which is a force having marvelous power at times over man's physical disabilities? Under great strain or stress, that will enables men to endure things which would, under or-

inary conditions, prostrate them completely. How does it do this?

Whatever the answer may be, it is clear that man's complexity is beyond his powers of analysis. He is a mystery to himself. A mystery he must remain. There is no help for it. Men are human, and the divine alone can comprehend all that humanity means and is. We are told that man was made in the image of God, but the metaphor can only apply to his spiritual nature. It cannot have reference to his body. That is too self-evident for argument. It cannot refer to his earthly experiences as he receives them through his sense-perceptions. That also is self-evident. On this basis, the soul-taking the word in the sense already indicated—must also be excluded. The spirit alone is left, and God is a spirit.

"Soul" is used loosely to indicate the intelligent part of man. "Spirit" is employed in a similar way. It may mean soul in the abstract or a disembodied soul, and sometimes it appears to mean merely the religious faculty. No such usage satisfies, and it is fatal in technical language. If spirit is the highest and most exalted part of man—no one will deny that—it cannot be a mere adjunct of soul or a mere state of soul. It must be, on the contrary the dominating factor in personality,—the thing that puts the divine element in man, and the thing that makes him a moral being. On that basis, soul is the force which enables a living body to experience the phenomena of sense, while spirit is the force which enables an embodied soul to think abstractly and choose righteously—or otherwise.

The possession of a soul involves a varying degree of intelligence, but it is always of an inferior sort. The possession of a spirit carries with it the highest kind of intelligence, and usage recognizes the fact, for a spirit, human or otherwise, is always good or bad, according to the choices which it makes, while a soul is commonly spoken of as if it were neutral and devoid of any moral quality. This gives us a logical sequence. Life organizes. Soul adds perception and intelligence. Spirit makes men godlike. But it also supplies the real basis for personality, since, other-

wise, animals would have a personality, and no animal ever does or can.

However odd this reasoning may seem, it is scriptural. It tallies exactly with the passage already considered (Mt. xvi. 25 f.), and it fits into other New Testament teachings. A word that is rendered "life" and "soul" in the same connection, where the fundamental idea is plainly one, must have reference to something attached to this world. It is therefore something permeating the body and using it as an instrument. Spirit refers to the higher faculties, to the mentality and moral qualities, and spirit is accordingly not the thing referred to. It is the force which lies between the two extremes—the soul. Along these lines there is still much to be learned, and a man's spirit is the thing which really constitutes the man himself. The rest is subordinate and incidental. The spirit is vital and eternal.

But if the spirit of a man is complex beyond the ability of the wisest of the race to analyze and interpret, what shall be thought of the spirit of the Creator who framed man and made him like himself, a personality potentially moral? Has He no complexity? Is He restricted to one solitary personality, while almost any man is able to manifest himself in three? Charles L. Dodgson is little known outside of the ranks of mathematicians, but as the author of "Alice's Adventures in Wonderland" he is known wherever the English language is spoken. He is no longer Charles L. Dodgson however, but Lewis Carroll. As such, he has revealed himself to children. He could not do so in his capacity as the author of abstruse mathematical works. The thing was impossible. He found a way,—as Lewis Carroll. But his powers were not even then exhausted, for he was still able to reveal himself as a father to children of his own. Is it hard now to see three personalities in the same individual? Does any one ever confuse the three in Charles L. Dodgson?

God, the Father, is the creator of the universe. Could He manifest himself as such to man? Could He show himself in all His majesty to the feeble creatures who walk this earth? And was He less able to exhibit a minor personality that would be comprehensible to them than Charles L.

Dodgson was to manifest himself to children? Christ, the Son, is God's manifestation of Himself to his human children, but He is still the same individual deity divested of His unapproachable and incomprehensible qualities. Christ, the children of men can understand. He speaks their language. The Holy Spirit remains; and, in that capacity, God acts as guide and monitor to His children, as a father would. He is, however, the same identical deity.

Poor and inadequate as the above metaphor is, it suggests the truth. Language is a faulty medium at best, and we have no means of accurately representing God's different manifestations of Himself. We have none for representing the different personalities which a man may exhibit, and so we use different names. To mathematicians, the author mentioned above is Charles L. Hodgson. To countless children he is known and loved as Lewis Carroll; but as Charles L. Hodgson he is both unknowable and unapproachable. When such a man has children of his own, he is known to them as "father," and this personality is unlike either of the others. There is but one individual man, however, back of the three manifestations, no matter how different they may be. Has God less power and versatility? Is it inconceivable, or irrational to suppose, that He could lay aside his personality as Creator and ruler of the universe, and, assuming a limited personality in a human frame, reveal himself to men? And could He not continue to influence the hearts of His people, as the Holy Spirit?

The use of the word Son is a stumbling block, and yet it is the best way we have to express the thought. It is also the most natural, since the body that was prepared was born of a woman. In no other manner was it possible to accomplish the desired result. Men perceive by the senses. That means a physical presence. A physical presence means a body. And that means a birth of some kind. Was it out of place to make use of the same creative power as He did when He put life into the world? A new creature, a god-man could thus be produced, whereby God could really manifest Himself to men. Was it necessary to resort to a bastard?

We cannot deny life. It is here, and we

have it. It is, however, a greater miracle in itself than any possible modification of the regular method of propagating it can be. Whence came it? Who gave it? And having given it, did the author of our being cease to have any power over it? If we cannot conceive how He did this particular thing, can we conceive how He has always propagated the life that He gave at the beginning? With all our boasted intelligence, how much do we really know concerning the secrets of the process itself? Which sex furnishes the primordial cell? That is in dispute. What determines sex? No one knows. Why are some persons mutually barren, although each may be fruitful with another mate? No one can tell. Why does a union of different races sometimes act in that same way? It is an unsolved mystery. And why do some such combinations make for progress, while others tend to degeneracy? No one can answer with authority.

But if we know so little of these things, is it the part of modesty to assume that we know what God could or could not do, when He decided to manifest himself to men? And if we refuse to believe what we do not understand, can we believe in any reproduction by a sexual process, or in digestion by the aid of various juices, or in sight itself, for that matter? We experience these things; but no one really understands them. No one can, save in part. How, then, can we understand the deeper things of God?

A wise man, they say, is never less alone than when he is alone. Such a man has within himself that which enables him to satisfy his desire for company; for he finds it possible to commune with himself. Ordinary persons are not able to do anything of that sort. Time never hangs heavy on a wise man's hands, for he is possessed of vision and can think ahead. But is it believable that God has less resources than a wise man has within himself? Is it, accordingly irrational to suppose that He communes with himself, as He is said to have done, in His different manifestations as Father and Son?

In all matters of this kind, men are really dealing with that which is beyond them. Men are human—finite. God is

(Vol. xviii.—14.)

divine—*infinite*. No man can by any possibility comprehend him. The best he can do is to reason feebly from analogy and try to apprehend the divine qualities and character. God will never cease to be God, and we shall never cease to be men,—in the sense that we are created beings. Is it, then, an evidence of intellectual superiority to flaunt our littleness in the face of our Heavenly Father and assume that He could not do what we cannot see how He was able to do? Is it an evidence of any such superiority to take a position which inevitably results in the assumption that He was reduced to the expedient of employing a bastard as the medium for his physical manifestation on earth? Was that the best that He could do, in providing a savior for mankind?

This is the logical dilemma to which the present tendency to deny the virgin birth and call all men divine, directly leads. It is a genuine slough of despond; but few of those who slip into its borders realize whither their footsteps are tending. To go on and be consistent is to sink into the quagmire of infidelity, since Christ must thus be made the most stupendous fraud in history. It will be the purpose of the next section to show how clear the evidence is that he was one of the two things already mentioned,—either Christ, the Son of God, in the sense given, or else Jesus, the Bastard, the son of an unknown father. If he was the latter, he was an impostor and a monumental one. There is no dodging that conclusion. But can the epithet be made to fit his character? Which is he,—a colossal hoax or the most precious inheritance of the ages, the Savior of mankind?

(To be continued.)

OUR LIBRARY FUND.

Hundreds of Libraries and Reading Rooms can be opened for THE BIBLE CHAMPION if we can furnish it free, we can secure the places as fast as we can get the money. It would be impossible to measure the influence of our Magazine upon the young people who do not know where to turn for the arguments in defence of the authority of the Scriptures.

The War in Methodism

THE EDITOR.

I.

Thomas Paine in his *American Crisis*, said, "These are the times that try men's souls." His modern followers are busy trying the souls of World-Wide Methodism. The warfare they are now engaged in suggests to all other Christian denominations that it will be well to get ready. Their time is coming. With some, it is already here.

The usual plan of campaign as outlined in the *What Not*, page 227, is being followed everywhere. In England, the third or last form of assault is adopted. Trusted men, who have given with seeming earnestness, pledges of loyalty to denominational standards, after obtaining places of power and influence, turn about and seek to overthrow the foundations which they took oath to maintain.

As Teachers in Denominational Schools, as Pastors of Influential Churches, as Editors of Religious Periodicals, or as Authors of Pamphlets and Books, they advocate doctrines antagonistic to those of their own denomination. When arraigned for their treachery, they loftily claim freedom of thought and speech and point to their deep religious experience and holy, spiritual living. The denomination desirous of avoiding strife and controversy, palters with the traitors and allows them without protest or rebuke to continue their evil seed-sowing. When the loyal members protest and appeal, they are bidden, for peace's sake, to discontinue their agitation.

Last year the issue came before the English Conference. Professor Jackson, author of "The Preacher and Modern Mind," an instructor in a school of training for young ministers, was to be re-elected. The loyal Methodists protested, and after a long debate were defeated, the main issue not being decided. The majority, for peace's sake, permitted the young ministers to sit for another year at the feet of their instructor in sacred things. Those who read our review of his book in the *CHAMPION*, November, 1913, know that if Ingersoll were to return from whichever world he now is in,

and were merely to discontinue his blasphemy and vulgarity, but teach the same doctrines he did so eloquently, when in the flesh, at 50 cents per, Professor Jackson would have in him no mean rival. Both would accomplish the same result and with almost identical arguments.

The defeated Methodists attempted to make an appeal to Methodism, but the denominational press was closed to them. They issued a circular letter, organized the Wesley Bible Union, and in January, 1914, issued the first number of a small quarterly magazine.

This year the issue was again up for discussion. The president-elect, Rev. Dinsdale T. Young, in his address to the Conference declared his faith "in the Bible as being from Genesis to Revelations a book inspired of God, and rightly interpreted, our unfailing guide in all matters of faith and practice." The most effective point in his splendid address, which made a deep impression, was "his charge that on some lips, 'Back to Christ' meant the snubbing of all the Apostles on the way back."

According to the trust deed, Methodist Church property can be used only for the propagation of the established doctrines of the denomination. There is a last resort, which cannot fail, when the loyal membership have tried all others. An appeal to the courts would undoubtedly enforce the conditions of the deed of trust. A number of cases in other denominations are a matter of record. In every case the decision has been for the rigid interpretations of the provisions of the trust deed.

In the Pastoral Session of the Conference this year, on four occasions the great issue was raised. A protest was made that *The Methodist Times* had favorably reviewed a "volume of such a character that it is nothing short of an outrage that its circulation should be aided by the Ministerial Editor of the paper. It does not pretend to find any authority in the Scriptures, but 'operates in the realm of religion with the idea of divine immanence.'

It denies that any of the commands of our Lord are binding upon us for anything like literal obedience, and asserts that to say our Lord is the only Saviour, is to keep some souls away from God." The reply to this protest was noise. "From the first introduction of the matter, noisy Modernists had endeavored to shout the speaker down. In that they did not succeed, but the tumult was intolerable; and these solemn judicial functions were exercised, or rather the exercise of them was denied, amid a scene of excitement which was quite unworthy of the occasion or the assembly. Next day every serious-minded Methodist man in the Conference was deplored the fact that Methodist constitutional usage had been thus trodden under foot." The *Journal* sums up the result: "Undoubtedly great good was done. An ex-president said, 'You lost the vote, but you won your case'; and a chairman of a district said, 'It is many a year before you will have such cause of complaint against the Methodist Press.' We thank God for all ground gained, and bid all our helpers take fresh courage."

THE CHIEF CORNER STONE.

AN ATTEMPT TO LULL METHODISTS INTO FALSE SECURITY.

"The volume which bears the above title is intended to reassure the faith of Methodists, but it lacks some of the necessary qualities for the accomplishment of its task. Faith will only be reassured by that which is definite. Great reassuring facts are required for faith. This volume is thoroughly indefinite. From start to finish there is hardly anything to lay firm hold of. Its writers have not decided what position they themselves are to occupy. They grope amid the mists for a message. At present they cling desperately to the old message, because they know no other. A bruised reed is so much better than no support at all! But the essays make it so very manifest that there is no basis in their misty premises for the old triumphant certainties; and faith is not likely to be reassured. It describes itself, with characteristic indefiniteness, as 'Essays toward an exposition'; but something with far

more definiteness and grip is required in dealing with unsophisticated men."

"Moreover, it is not clear where it starts from. Nowhere does it attempt to give those 'assured results' of the 'Higher Criticism' which make it necessary to re-cast our views of the Bible. Those new views of the Scripture which the book assumes are based upon something. What are the 'assured results' from which they start and which necessitate the new views?"

"And again, whither are the writers seeking to lead their public? They do not say what revised views of the Bible and of our Lord and of the Christian Faith they actually hold. What is their view of Scripture? What use would they continue to make of it? If Deuteronomy would by unacademic lips be called a forgery, would they still use it for solemn lessons in the Sanctuary? If, as Mr. Wiseman suggests, the view should prevail that Abraham never existed, does it really help us to be told that 'one's profit in reading and confidence in expounding the lovely story is not lessened?' What conceivable view of the Bible justifies this remark? Or if the New Testament is correctly described by Mr. Holdsworth as 'the literary remains of the first century of our era,' what measure of reverence is it to receive? Or, if, as Dr. Moulton holds, St. Paul's mistakes are such and his ways of using the Old Testament so peculiar as to make him largely impossible for us, what is the true position of his Epistles? Are they or are they not part of the veritable Word of God to mankind to be used in solemn acts of public worship, and so forth? This volume does not tell us the position it starts from, nor even the new position to which it desires to lead us. It lacks either light or courage, and both these qualities are needed to justify its existence. Great numbers of Methodists are just awakening to the true state of affairs. They begin to realize the tragedy which has overtaken us. This volume is intended to lull them into a false security." The *Journal* of the Wesley Bible Union, October 1914.

The book is reviewed at length by the new Secretary, Dr. H. C. Morton, and the Editors, Dr. W. Spiers, and Dr. G. A. Benetts. The selection above is by the Sec-

retary, Dr. Morton. The Essays are studied in detail and by quotations shown to be what the book is called by Dr. Morton, An Attempt to Lull Methodists into False Security. It is interesting to note that "The Chief Corner Stone" has just been issued by the Methodist Book Concern in this country. Is it a part of the general campaign throughout Methodism? Is it offered as a sedative to American Methodism? "Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird."

WESLEY BIBLE UNION NOTES.

"One of the chief perils of the hour is, lest the soldiers of Jesus Christ should be so absorbed in the war between the European nations as to allow their attention to be drawn off from the interests of the Redeemer's Kingdom. The greatest service we can render to our country in relation to this war, is to exert ourselves to our very utmost to bring our nation to the feet of the Saviour. The issues at stake in this war are not only those which are the immediate matters of controversy between the nations. All Bible students know that calamities such as these come upon nations in the Providence of God on account of national sins which are not immediately connected with the form in which the Divine judgment comes."

"We may learn an important lesson as bearing upon this subject from the seventh chapter of Joshua. The Israelites were beaten before Ai because of the sin of Achan. The words of Jos. vii. 13 may be appropriately addressed to the churches of England at this hour: 'Up, sanctify the people, and say: Sanctify yourselves against to-morrow: for thus saith Jehovah God of Israel: There is an accursed thing in the midst of thee, O Israel; thou canst not stand before thine enemies until ye take away the accursed thing.'"

"It is very significant that the nation from which the pestilence of rationalistic criticism has fallen upon the churches of Christendom is now proving to be the scourge of Europe. We believe there is a close connection between this war, and the

twin evils of lax doctrine and lax living which are blighting the churches of the world. If the churches had maintained a higher standard, they would have produced a national atmosphere in which it would have been impossible for this demoniacal frenzy of militarism to live and thrive."

"It is also very significant that this calamity should synchronize with the formal departure of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference from the doctrines which have created and maintained the Methodist Revival. It may seem to some far-fetched to suggest any connection between the two things. But we believe that Methodism is the greatest creation of the Holy Spirit which the ages have yet seen, and the declaration of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference that a book, which attacks the authority and veracity of Holy Scripture, and which denies the infallibility of the teachings of Christ, is not in conflict with our Standards, is in our eyes such a terrible fall of the best Church of God on earth that one cannot be surprised at a world-wide calamity resulting therefrom."

"If this view of things be correct, then the greatest service which any of us can render to the restoration of peace and well-being to England and to Europe, is to do our utmost to bring about a crusade for the removal of the deadly mischiefs which are bringing the wrath of God upon the nations. Some well-meaning but greatly mistaken people stand in dread of theological controversy. But in presence of deadly anti-Christian error, abstinence from controversy is sin of the worst kind. Those who quietly surrender the lambs of Christ's flock to be the prey of 'the grievous wolves' which are ravaging the church, are themselves guilty accomplices in the crime, as John has told us: 'Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ hath not God: he that abideth in the teaching, the same hath both the Father and the Son. If any one cometh unto you, and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not into your house, and give him no greeting: for he that giveth him greeting *partaketh in his evil works*'" (2 John, 9-11).

"The terrible mischief which we have to combat is manifest from the general tone of the *Methodist Recorder* and *Methodist Times*, which constantly display strong sympathy with these deplorable Modernist doctrines. The appointment of Rev. George Jackson to the conduct of the Reading Circle in the *Recorder* is an indication of what we mean. The leading Methodist newspaper could not in any more definite way have proclaimed itself to be in favor of a revolution of Methodist Theology than by appointing Mr. Jackson to the post of seeking to guide the reading of Young Methodism. It may be said that this is a literary and not a theological appointment. But theology is all-pervasive. A man's religious convictions necessarily mould and control all his conduct and all his thinking. Besides, many of the books in the reading circle are of a religious character. The theological opinions of the conductor of the circle will necessarily control the selection of the books and their treatment in discussion in the columns of the paper."

The Journal of the Wesley Bible Union,
October, 1914.

II.

The Methodist Episcopal Church in America has reached the second stage of the war. The Graded Lessons which the Presbyterian Church discontinued largely because they were un-Biblical and taught dangerous doctrines, are published by a syndicate, two of the members of which are the Methodist Episcopal and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. The former is the publisher. In addition to it, or a part of it, are books by such authors as Professor Kent, of Yale University. His book we have reviewed in the CHAMPION. It is filled with the most deadly error and is unmistakably antagonistic to Methodist Doctrine. We have reviewed or noticed books of the same character by authors who are professors in Wesleyan, North Western and Boston Universities. We review in this number a book by the president of the Iliff School of Theology, Denver, a denominational school. Some of these books are published by the Methodist Book Concern. A long article in the

Methodist Review, by the late Professor Terry, informed us that Balaam's ass was dead again. A number of pages were filled with what seemed to be a quotation from the documents of which the Pentateuch was composed. We asked one of the great scholars of the world where we could find the quotation. He replied, in *The Oxford Hexateuch*. Fortunately, each verse was numbered. All we had to do was to cut out the verses and paste them together in their order numerically to have the original story of the Pentateuch. What made the article sad and pathetic beyond words was the fact that the same author, in the same magazine many years before, had written an article on Balaam. It was scholarly, convincing, and in harmony with the teaching of Evangelical Christianity from the beginning.

The General Conference, unlike the English Conference, met the issue squarely. It ordered that the standards of Methodism and of Evangelical Christianity should be regarded. If it was demanded by honest teaching to mention any of the disputed statements, the word "tentative" should be affixed, so no one could possibly be deceived. It will probably be necessary for some one to explain why, in the face of this authoritative and unequivocal prohibition, literature antagonistic to both Methodist and Evangelical standards should be published and pushed by the denominational publishing house. An Old Testament History and a New Testament History are to be issued, and the writers selected are scholars well known to be not in harmony with denominational standards. So far, all this deluge of Counterfeit Critical literature has been poured forth without a protest from the official press. If it had been Russelism instead of Counterfeit Criticism, not an Advocate would have failed to be recorded as a defender of the faith of the Church. No thoughtful person will fail to see how much more dangerous the latter is than the former. The latter wins earnest consideration by the very statement that it is the assured result of the universal scholarship of the world. The former affronts every sensible person by the absurdity of the appeals to credulity and ignorance.

III.

The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, is in the first stage of the war. We said in an Appeal published in the denominational press: "The Bible League of North America most earnestly appeals for your co-operation because you are so orthodox. You are known to be nearer primitive Methodism than any other branch of the family." The Bishops in their address to the General Conference, May, 1914, said: "While we would not put forward any such claim for ourselves, we cannot overlook the fact that we have been preserved against some perils which have beset others; and in gratitude to God for his mercy to us we should render peculiar service in our place. In a day when all sorts of unverified theories concerning matters political, social, and religious are heralded as final philosophies because they affirm what no balanced mind in any former generation ever accepted, and deny what the wisest and most devout of all the ages have most assuredly believed, our Church has a mission of the most sacred character to fulfil."

The cloud, no larger than a man's hand, may be seen in the horizon. Of course, as always, elsewhere, so here, we greet one of our old friends, the three Bible characters which we have named. The *Texas Advocate* contains a short article by J. P. Chambers calling attention to a book review in the *Methodist Review* by a professor of Vanderbilt University. The review began thus: "According to the author—and he has most scholars in agreement with him—the book of Jonah is not a record of actual happenings. . . . More significant, perhaps, is the attempt to show that a man can live for a time within a whale." The article, while short, is trenchant and merciless. He cites other wonders as incredible as the whale episode; Elijah bringing fire down by prayer, Daniel delivered from the lions, the Hebrews delivered from the fiery furnace, the miracles of Christ—raising Lazarus, and others. He names the greatest miracle of all, Christ's sinless life, and adds, "Why not eliminate the resurrection of Christ?"

A stinging paragraph appears in black-faced type, which we copy:

"A few more things I cannot understand:

If we, as a religious denomination accept all the Bible, why is such stuff permitted to be published in our periodicals? Are any of these 'most scholars' in the employ of our Church? If so, why are they not discharged, and that immediately?"

Six months later another book review by the same Vanderbilt professor appeared in the *Methodist Review*. A correspondent of the *New Orleans Christian Advocate* characterized it as containing "statements which were so in accord with modern infidelity and so subversive of faith in the WORD OF GOD, and so repugnant to the Second and Sixth Articles of our Christian Faith, that I felt it was my duty to call attention to this method of inveighing against our doctrine."

No notice being taken of his protest, he calls attention to the October number, which is bristling with its pointed thrusts at the inerrancy of the Scriptures." Another author is allowed to say: "The Theology of Revelation faltering on the now hollow ground of Scripture infallibility was more broadly based upon a new historical interpretation of the Bible, of dogma, of the world and the soul."

"May I also direct your attention to some clauses, heartily endorsed by Dr. James Mudge (Malden, Mass.):

"But this high estimate of the practical revelative value of the Bible is not tantamount to affirming any of the theories of the Bible, which set it over against all other books as 'infallible' or 'inerrant'; nor does it justify any language which provides an absolute distinction between the nature of the record and all other records. The Bible is not a record of a now discontinued revelation."

The article is bold, clear, faithful, and has this significant paragraph in conclusion:

"I should dislike very much to have to carry this matter to the Book Committee and the Annual Conference, but I feel that the Church and our young ministers must be protected at all hazards; and I wish to state that I am by no means alone in this feeling. There are quite a number of ministers who share fully with me my views in regard to this matter and who are willing to stand with me in bringing it to the attention of the Church."

That has the right ring. Heresy hunting has become a jest and a by-word of scoffing. But it does not take a bank long to oust a director who betrays it; it does not take a stock exchange long to expel a broker who dishonors it by robbing his customers; it does not take a lawyers' Association long to get rid of a shyster who violates every vow of honor and integrity and brings the fraternity into disrepute; even in politics we learn the standard of honor is so high that the politician who violates his pledge is as guilty as if he had stolen trust funds committed to him. So Secretary of State

TO METHODIST LEADERS.

A marked copy of this number of *THE BIBLE CHAMPION* has been sent to one thousand leading Ministers of the two great branches of American Methodism. They are the Leaders who, second only to the Bishops in power and influence, have the over-sight of the daily activities of the Church, and the creation and education of public sentiment upon all religious matters. They are men known to be true to Methodist standards, and loyal to Methodist usages. It is in their power to bring Peace to the Church and put an end to the strife and dissension within the denomination. No "heresy hunting" is necessary. Each in his jurisdiction needs but to lead a return to "the old paths" and see to it that the Church and Ministry are not deceived by the leaders of infidelity who pose as the incarnation of the Modern Mind. Methodist Ministers, who receive this number, or are our regular readers, are solicited to give us briefly their suggestions for a symposium in future numbers of *THE CHAMPION*. It will interest our readers of all other denominations. The campaign is the same everywhere. *Is it a Conspiracy?*

PASTOR BLAMES WAR ON LAX CHRISTIANS.

The Rev. John Henry Jowett, rector of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, said yesterday he believed that if there had been greater attendance in the churches throughout the world there would not have been any war. He declared that all over the two hemispheres there has been a great falling off in the church attendance.

Bryan informed the Legislature of Pennsylvania in an address not long since.

When Christian men, ministers and laymen, demand that the highly paid servant who debauches those whom he influences and strikes a deadly blow at the life of the denomination, shall step down and out, the Church can then dare compare herself with the worldly organizations named above. All fair-minded men will approve whatever may be necessary in righteousness to keep the Church as scrupulous of her honor as the world does in every business and professional relation.

"The same conditions apply everywhere," Dr. Jowett added. "Members of churches are asleep, many of them half dead, and others dead to the duties of the church. When I spoke last Monday to members of the Presbytery in the new Park Avenue Presbyterian Church I called attention to the manner in which the attendance of our churches has been reduced.

"I told the members that the same conditions prevailed in my own church. But since the war began there has been a growing tendency here among the people to be more exacting in their spiritual duties. I believe that before many weeks there will be a great improvement not only in the churches here but also in other countries. The war has brought home to many the need of devotion."

The above clipping from the *New York World*, Thursday, November 12, will show that the war is not confined to any one denomination. It is at its deadly work in all. Every Christian of every creed should be aroused to the most energetic effort to stay and banish the evil.

Says Prof. T. Harwood Pattison: "It was Jeremiah who gave Byron the hint for his grand and gloomy sketch 'Darkness'; it was Job that suggested 'Thanatopsis' to Bryant. But for Paul's great chapter on the resurrection of the dead, we should never have had Wordsworth's 'Ode to Immortality.'"

The advance in subscription of all subscribers for one year would lift our burden and insure our future. Do it now!

THE COUNCIL

THE BIBLE OF THE Y. M. I. A.

"The Bible—Its Age and Authors."

As taught by the Secretary of the Y. M. C. A., 23d Street, New York City.

I. Its Age.

1. Later Jewish Traditions.

a. Assert that the Old Testament was written by men who lived from the time of Moses to the time of Ezra (1400 to 400 B. C.). b. Assert that the New Testament was written between the time of Paul's First Letters and the writing of the Revelation (40 to 100 A. D.). c. Bible students to-day put little dependence upon these Jewish traditions, and Josephus does not help us any.

2. Present day beliefs.

a. The Old Testament in its present form dates from the second century B. C., the different books being written between the eighth and second century. b. The New Testament in its present form dates from the third century A. D., the different books being written between the time of Paul's First Letters and the time of Second Peter. c. This makes the period of the Old Testament preparation somewhat shorter than it was supposed, and the New Testament somewhat longer, depending upon the date of Second Peter.

II. Its Authors.

1. Old Testament Authors.

a. It was formerly supposed that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, Joshua, the book which bears his name, Samuel, his, etc. The Christian Church has held pretty firmly to this idea until recent years, but the great majority of the Bible scholars of the present reject it. The basis for Mosaic authorship rests upon statements in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, which were written more than a thousand years after Moses lived. Probably few, if any, of the books in the Old Testament were put into their present form by the men whose names they bear. In most cases they are the merest outlines of what was written or spoken, although in most instances probably the experiences of the men formed the basis for the account.

III. Whence Came This Hebrew Old Testament?

1. The greater part of the Old Testament and much of the Gospels is a product of compilation and editing, because the Bible contains only a small part of the great body of Hebrew literature. Some one selected and some one edited.

2. Evidence of compilation is seen almost at a glance when we turn our attention to the Pentateuch, for we find duplicate and triplicate narratives. We find in one series of accounts one name given to God and in another series another name. This duplication is true concerning accounts of the Creation, the Flood, the death of Sisera, the bondage in Egypt, and the Exodus.

3. The Judean prophetic narrative.

a. In about the ninth century B. C. there seems to have been an attempt to gather up the traditions and to write a sort of history of the Hebrew people from the viewpoint of the Southern Kingdom. The Kingdom of Solomon having been divided in about 937 B. C., forming the kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

4. Ephraim prophetic narratives.

a. In the next century, the eighth, there seems to have been a similar attempt made from the viewpoint of the Northern Kingdom, sometimes spoken of as Ephraim, or Israel.

5. The reforms of Hezekiah.

a. The reforms of Hezekiah were instituted for the purpose of unifying the religious worship, and after the fall of the Northern Kingdom in 722 B. C. the Judean and Ephraim narratives were combined. This combined narrative forms the basis of the books of our Bible from Genesis to Judges.

6. Probably as a result of the preaching of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah, the "Book of the Law" was written. It was discovered in the temple in the 18th year of the reign of Josiah (621 B. C.). It is the basis of our present book of Deuteronomy. The historical material covering the time of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, was rearranged to emphasize the teachings of Deuteronomy.

7. Shortly after the fall of Jerusalem (586 B. C.) the Judean-Ephraimite narrative was prefixed to Deuteronomy, and the Former Prophets (Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings) were added (about 550 B. C.).

8. The Priestly Narratives.

a. The Priestly Narratives were the result of labor of priests like Ezekiel during the Babylonian captivity. These narratives make up the book of Leviticus and the greater part of Exodus and Numbers, and are found throughout all the books from Genesis to Joshua inclusive.

9. The Law or Pentateuch.

a. Sometime before 432 B. C. a compilation from the Judean-Ephraimite, Deuteronomic, and Priestly narratives was completed, forming our law or Pentateuch. b. The Hebrews grouped the historical and prophetic books together, indicating that they regarded history more as a basis for prophecy than as a record of facts. c. The Prophetic Canon was completed about 200 B. C. "Prophets" first mentioned by Ben-Sira about 180 B. C. The Prophetic Canon contained the Former Prophets (Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings) and Latter Prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve, or Minor Prophets).

10. The Ecclesiastical History.

a. After the restoration the priestly interests predominated and the history was recast from the ecclesiastical viewpoint, and we have as a result the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, written between 350 and 250 B. C. This history is continued in First Maccabees written about 100 B. C.

11. The Writings or Hagiographa.

a. The other books of our Old Testament, Psalms, Ruth, Lamentations, Job, Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, and Songs of Solomon, most of which had been written before, and the Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, which had been written, at least, a century before, and Esther and Daniel, which had been recently written, were admitted to the Canon between 160 and 150 B. C. The earliest mention of this Canon is in the Prologue to Ecclesiastes, written about 132 B. C.

12. All three Canons were ratified at the Council of Jamnia in 96 and 118 A. D. The Old Testament books assumed their present form between 850 and 150 B. C.,

and were accepted as canonical between 625 B. C. and 100 A. D. We have no idea how many unknown authors have had a hand in the preparation of the Old Testament narratives as we have them.

King Phillip rising from a feast of several hours was begged by a subject to examine her cause. He was displeased and gave sentence against her. The subject calmly replied, "I appeal!" "From your king? To whom then?" "From Phillip drunk, to Phillip sober!" He gave a second hearing and reversed his decision. We appeal in behalf of the young men who are being led astray by the false teaching above. We appeal from the Y. M. I. A. to the Y. M. C. A. No words need be added but to quote the declaration of faith as adopted by the International Convention. If this organization with such a brilliant record for faithful and useful Christian service is to permit un-Christian doctrine to be taught the young men committed to its care, the end is not far away. The overwhelming mass of Y. M. C. A. workers who are true to their own confession of faith should refuse longer to permit a handful, by their folly to bring the whole body into disrepute.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION,

Y. M. C. A.

Portland, 1869.

"Resolved, That as these organizations bear the name of Christian, and profess to be engaged directly in the Saviour's service, so it is clearly their duty to maintain the control and management of all their affairs in the hands of those who profess to love and publicly avow their faith in Jesus, the Redeemer, as Divine, and who testify their faith by becoming and remaining members of churches held to be Evangelical. And we hold those churches to be Evangelical which, maintaining the Holy Scriptures to be the only infallible rule of faith and practice, do believe in the Lord Jesus Christ (the only begotten of the Father, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords) in whom dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and who was made sin for us though knowing no sin, bearing our sins in

his own body on the tree) as the only name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved from everlasting punishment *and to life eternal.*" (Italics added by vote of International Convention, Indianapolis, 1893.)

RUSSELISM AND MODERNISM.

Two New Religions are battling for a place among the Old Religions of the World. Their success is problematical. So far no one has offered to be crucified and resurrected in proof of the faith of either. We desire but to suggest a few likenesses and unlikenesses of the new candidates.

Both seem to have studied *bird-ology*, as each have a feathered symbol. Russelism, the parrot, "you can teach it to say anything, but it does not know what it is saying." Modernism prefers the cuckoo. It avoids the trouble of nest-building by laying its eggs in another bird's nest. It avoids the care of its progeny by permitting the other bird to feed and protect hem. The cuckoo characteristic develops early; when over-crowded by its foster-brothers, it throws them out of the nest and thus is able to monopolize all the care of the parent birds and *all the food*.

Russelism is only the parrot-like repetition of the stupidities and follies of the founder. Modernism, whether its truth is original or borrowed, never propagates it at its own expense. It does not build hurches, or schools or establish publishing ouses. It borrows them—*without leave*. It generally selects those, whose faith it eeks to undermine and overthrow.

Both make large use of the Press. Russelism selects the secular press and pays egular newspaper advertising rates. It leads its advertisements with its own fame and boldly announces its mission and purpose. Modernism, poses as Evangelical, and a devout student and lover of the Holy Scriptures. It is either an editor, or a publisher, or has a friend, or sympathizer at court. Largely if not nifly, houses and periodicals whose faith assails, are its chosen channels through which to exploit its views. Those who teach, seek places in schools whose relations to a Denomination are either direct or indirect. The doctrines of the Denom-

ination are shown to be antiquated, un-scholarly, and fit only for the morgue. Instead, they offer the product of the Modern Mind. When you scan it closely, you find it only a pick-up from the infidel muck-heap of the past of long ago.

The list might be continued but this will suffice. What would be the result if Russelism were thus to be exploited in Evangelical Schools, Churches, and Literature? The suggestion alone would invite explosion. Plain Common Sense asks, judged by the final result to the Church what choice is there between them? Both are alike antagonistic to the fundamentals of Evangelical Christianity. Neither has any right to expect anything from Christians but denunciation, when they creep into churches and try to take captive silly men and women and lead them away from the truth as it is taught in the Word of God.

A HOLY WAR.

The day is not far distant when Protestantism will proclaim A Holy War! All Denominations will wage it. It is not difficult to predict in outline the main features of the Campaign.

1. No Person will be received into Church Membership, who does not declare "belief in the Doctrines of the Holy Scriptures as set forth in the Articles of Religion," *without mental reservation*. The Articles of Religion declare: "In the name of the Holy Scriptures we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church. The names of the canonical books are:—then the names of all the books now found in the Bible are given."

2. No man will be received into the Ministry, who when asked, "Do you unfeignedly believe all the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments?" will not answer, "I believe them," *without mental reservation*.

When asked, "Will you be ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word?" Will answer, "I will, the Lord being my helper," *without mental reservation*.

3. No doctrine shall be taught in Sun-

day School, Pulpit, College, University or Theological School not in harmony with the standards of the Doctrines of the Denomination.

4. No doctrine shall be advocated in any Book, Pamphlet or Periodical, by a member of the Denomination, nor be published by the Publishing House of the Denomination, not in harmony with the Standards of Doctrine of the Denomination.

It will be apparent to the most thoughtless that these provisions are only guards against treason and treachery.

Any desirous of regaining the liberty of speech and thought which they surrendered when they entered the Church, can easily do so,—*by withdrawing*. Then they can free their mind and heart to the utmost and can be regarded and treated as honorable combatants.

The query will immediately arise, "Will not this at once set the whole Church in a ferment, by heresy hunting?" Not at all. The fundamental Doctrines of Evangelical Christianity are well known to all intelligent men and women. When they are impugned, assailed, decried, or denied, no one will be deceived. Furthermore, when the assailant knows that war has been declared, he will cease all public offence. He knows the number of positions worth while, outside of Evangelical Christianity are very few. He will not throw away a good thing, until he is sure of one as good. So far as our observation goes, the critic shows no symptoms of seeking martyrdom for his convictions, if it means loss of place, power or income.

"What will happen, then?" The average man and woman, without scholarship, familiar with the Scriptures, of devout life, and active in religious service will settle the matter without controversy. A postal card will suffice.

When it is known that a Publishing House persists in open violation of the prohibition to undermine the doctrines of the Denomination, every Christian buying anything with the imprint of the House need only drop a card to headquarters, saying "I will not buy, read or handle anything with your imprint upon it while you are a traitor to the Denomination. I will urge all my friends to do likewise."

When a School persists in violating the prohibition every patron of the School can drop a postal card to the same effect as above and cease all support and recognition of the School.

When a Superintendent or Teacher in a Sunday School violates the order of the Church, their removal is very easily secured. If not, empty seats will be a silent protest that nothing can resist.

When a Pastor publicly teaches doctrines contrary to the standards of the Church, a postal card to the same effect as the others above will suffice. If not, empty seats will.

It must be remembered that Liberal Christians are few; what there are, are not active in the religious work of the Church. A Church left to them to run, would have to surrender in very short order.

Liberal Christians are not generous patrons of the great Denomination interests. They have a preferable use for their money than Missions, or other Church Benevolences or even for local Church support.

The Liberal Christians of the Nation are such a beggarly handful, that they are a negligible quantity. Does any one know what fraction of one percent of the whole, they constitute, when they can be estimated? All men who seek generous compensation for religious service, whether as Pastors, Teachers, or Authors, would know better than to alienate Evangelical Christianity and turn to the fraction of the one percent Liberals.

If there is no way to save Christianity in America save a Holy War, the sooner it is proclaimed the better.

The advance in subscription of all subscribers for one year would lift our burden and insure our future. Do it now!

F. R. A. De Chateaubriand.—French author and statesman. In "The Genius of Christianity." I. 3.

"The doctrine of the existence of a God is demonstrated by the wonders of the universe. A design of Providence is evident in the instincts of animals and in the beauty of nature."

THE CLUB

THE PENTATEUCH.

The word Pentateuch means fivefold book and has become the most common title of the first five books of the Old Testament. By many writers these ancient volumes are called the Five Books of Moses, and in the later portions of the Old Testament they are spoken of as "The Book of the Law of the Lord by the hand of Moses," (2 Chron. xxxiv, 14,) "The Book of the Law of Moses," (Neh. viii, 1,) "The Book of Moses," (Neh. xiii, 1,) and "The Law of Moses," (Ezra vii, 6.) In later times they were frequently designated by the simple name, *Torah, the Law*. The Mosaic origin of these sacred books is thus apparently assumed as an unquestioned belief in the later books of the Bible, was accepted by the New Testament writers, and is indicated by such passages in the Pentateuch itself as the following: "The Lord said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in a (Heb. the) book (Ex. xvii. 14); "Moses wrote all the words of the Lord," (Ex. xxiv. 4); "And the Lord said unto Moses, write thou these words," etc., (Ex. xxxiv. 27); "Moses wrote their goings out according to their journeys by the commandment of the Lord," (Num. xxxiii. 2); "Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests the sons of Levi." (Deut. xxxi. 9).

The five books are now commonly known as Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy; but these names, like the word Pentateuch, are of Greek origin, and the division of the Book of the Law into these five parts is believed by many to have been made by the Septuagint translators. In the Hebrew text these parts form so many intimately connected sections of one whole, and are designated by the first words of each section. In Hebrew manuscripts the entire law is divided into fifty-four sections, thus providing a distinct reading lesson for each Sabbath of the year; for according to Jewish modes of reckoning, some years had fifty-four Sabbaths, and care was accordingly taken that in these longer years no Sab-

bath should be unprovided with its separate lesson. Some of the ancient Jews divided the law into one hundred and fifty-five sections, thus providing a series of Sabbath lessons to continue through three consecutive years. But all these divisions of the Pentateuch recognize the unity of the entire work, and this unity becomes more apparent by a careful study of its contents."

"Whatever one's views of the origin, number, and variety of documents used in the composition of the Pentateuch, it is scarcely possible fairly to deny that it presents in its present form an orderly and well related whole. The Book of Genesis is an appropriate and necessary introduction to the history of the covenant people. It opens with the creation of man, and traces his history in narrowing circles down to the divine call of Abraham, and thence onward to the burial of Jacob, when the twelve tribe-fathers of Israel, had become clearly set in personal and historical outline before us. The Book of Exodus opens with the names of those great tribe-fathers of the nation, and furnishes a vivid history of the exodus from the land of Egypt, the journey to Sinai, and the legislation and worship ordained at the holy mount. The Book of Leviticus follows, in natural order, furnishing an additional record of the Sinaitic legislation, especially as it related to the Levitical priesthood, and the sacrifices, offerings, and ceremonial rites of the chosen people. The Book of Numbers appropriately follows, and records the numbering and journeys of the Israel in the wilderness, from their departure from Sinai until they became established on the east of Jordan. Deuteronomy is professedly a recapitulation of the wilderness journeys of Israel and of the legislation mediated through Moses, and, with the exception of the last chapter, (Deut. xxxiv.) might well have been prepared under the personal oversight and dictation of Moses himself.

That these five books, in substantially their present form originated with Moses,

or under his immediate supervision, was the common belief of all Jewish and Christian antiquity. The great body of evangelical Christians still regard these sacred records as embodying the most ancient monuments of history, biography, laws, poetry, and prophecy. Whatever their date or origin, they are of incalculable worth. They shed invaluable light on ancient customs and important epochs in the history of ancient nations. As literary documents they are vastly more valuable than all that has been or is likely to be deciphered from the monuments of Egypt, Assyria, Babylon and Persia. As records of divine revelation, they constitute the historical and legislative groundwork of the Jewish and the Christian faith. By them we are made acquainted with the creation and fall of man, with the repeated appliances of divine grace and judgment to restrain him from sin and lead him in the ways of righteousness, with successive and gradually fuller disclosures of God's word and will, and with the methods and purposes of redemption. It is in fact difficult to overrate the value of these first books of the Bible as embodying the substantial elements of all subsequent divine revelation.

That this ancient tradition is well grounded appears from a variety of considerations. The last four books of the Pentateuch claim over and over again, in the plainest and most positive manner, to be a record of what the Lord communicated to Moses, and commanded him to set before the Israelitish people. The three middle books are filled with details of what "Jehovah spake unto Moses." We find no law or statement thus introduced which contains any thing inconsistent with such claims. No character depicted in the Old Testament has such a unique grandeur as that of Moses; and there is none besides to whom such a body of laws as those of the Pentateuch can be so fittingly attributed. The subsequent history of Israel is full of incidental allusions to laws, customs, and institutions of which the Pentateuch makes him, under God, the author. The ark and tabernacle appear as the central seat of worship at Shiloh until the ark was captured by the Philistines and God forsook the tabernacle, 1 Sam. iv. 22; Psa.

lxxviii. 60. The irregularities of worship between that time and the building of the temple at Jerusalem were owing to the fact that during this dark period there was no central sanctuary, and the people were greatly demoralized. 1 Kings iii. 2. The Prophets and the Psalms abound in allusions to the exodus from Egypt and the ministry of Moses in such ways as to recognize that period as the greatest epoch of the national history. Finally, our Lord himself accepted this tradition, and expressed himself in language which cannot be naturally explained without admitting that he corroborated the common belief of his nation. John v. 46, 47; vii. 19, 22.

This ancient and uniform tradition must, according to all legitimate principles of criticism, be accepted as *prima facie* evidence in favor of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. It is indeed only *presumptive proof* of such authorship, and so has the right to stand, until its incorrectness has been shown. The burden of proof falls, therefore, rightly upon those who doubt the ancient tradition. When evidence adverse to the Mosaic authorship is brought forward, it becomes the student of history and all lovers of the truth to weigh such evidence, and to see if it be of a nature to set aside the ancient view. We should allow no love of ancient opinions, no prejudice of any kind, to hinder our careful examination of facts, or to bias our judgment; but we are not called upon to give up our opinions, though based on incomplete evidence, until other and better evidence shall be brought against them. The truth, the whole truth, so far as it may be ascertained, and nothing but the truth will satisfy the honest Christian scholar.—*Prof. Milton S. Terry, D.D., 1889. Introduction to the Pentateuch, Whedon's Commentary.*

Milton and Shakespeare, as nearly every person who reads much is aware, are among the greater writers whose works contain many references to Scripture. Without a knowledge of the Sacred Book the author of "Paradise Lost" and other great poems cannot be rightly understood, and the same is true of many of the other English poets of the highest rank.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST.

T. ROBINSON.

In the October number of the CHAMPION is an article on the Virgin Birth of Christ by H. W. Magoun in which the writer says, "He was born out of Wedlock," and so He was either the Son of God, or He was a "bastard."

I think the writer is mistaken. Jesus was not a bastard even if He was not the Son of God.

The law defines a bastard as follows: 1st. "A child *begotten* and *born* outside of lawful matrimony. 2nd. "A child born while the husband of the mother was separated from her for a whole year previous to its birth."

You will see at a glance that Jesus comes under neither of the above definitions.

Matthew wrote his Gospel primarily to convince the Jews that Jesus was the promised Messiah. To do this, he must first establish three facts. First: that He was the lineal descendant of Abraham. Second: That He was a like descendant of the Tribe of Judah; That He was a lineal descendant of David. He went to the public records kept in the Temple and copied them, thus tracing Him from Abraham down to "Joseph, the husband of Mary of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ." He thus traces Jesus to Joseph.

Then he states that Mary who was betrothed to Joseph before they came together, was found to be with child of the Holy Spirit. That Joseph meant to put her away privily. That while he was thinking on the matter an Angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream and told him to take unto himself "Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit." That Joseph did as the Angel told him and took unto himself his wife, and knew her not until she had brought forth a Son.

Thus the testimony of Matthew corroborated by that of Luke, shows that Jesus was born while his mother and Joseph were living together as lawful husband and wife. That He was taken to the Temple and presented to the Lord, and that He was registered under the name of Jesus in Greek, or Joshua in Hebrew, as

of the house of Judah and David as the son of Joseph. The whole evidence shows that He was not a "bastard" under any definition of that word ever known to law.

I do not understand that the Jews of His day ever so called Him. They evidently knew that He was born shortly after Joseph and Mary were married, and believed that Joseph was His father, and that He was begotten before His parents were lawfully married, and was thus the son of "fornication" and so they said to Him on one occasion, "We be not born of fornication. We have one Father, even God" (John, chapter 8, verse 41), evidently throwing his untimely birth at Him. But that they regarded Joseph as His father is shown in John, chapter 6, verse 42, "And they said, is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know; how is it then he saith I came down from Heaven?"

Mary was the only direct competent witness as to how or by whom He was begotten. Her testimony must stand unless her reputation for truth and veracity can be successfully impeached. This has never been done. In saying this I utterly reject the statement first made by Celsus some one hundred fifty years after her death. "No one knows who he was or when or where he was born." But his writings show that he knew nothing of the Jewish law of registering in the public records of the birth and lineage of a son. Matthew copied these records within twenty-five years after the death of Jesus and published them for the Jews who never contradicted the record set forth by him.

We are aware that the Higher Critics of the Wellhausen school reject the first two chapters of Matthew's Gospel and say they were added at a later date. But before they would be allowed to set up their claim in any of our Courts they would have to show by competent evidence, that at, or about the time Matthew's Gospel was first published there were other copies of the same with these two chapters missing. They have never shown it.

The only other competent witness as to when or by whom Jesus was begotten is Joseph, and he would only be allowed to testify as to his dream and that he be-

lieved and acted upon it as related by Matthew.

The above is all there is of competent human testimony on this point.

Next; what, if anything, does Jesus say on this point? Apply to His sayings the rule of law older than His advent. It is this "A person in his public sayings shall be taken and held to mean that which a person of ordinary intelligence listening to him would understand him to mean." Apply this rule to His saying as recorded in John's Gospel, chapter 8, verses 57 and 58. "Then said the Jews unto Him, thou are not yet fifty years old and hast thou seen Abraham?" Mark the question—"Hast thou *seen* Abraham?" The answer, "Verily, Verily I say unto you before Abraham was I am." A person of ordinary intelligence listening to Him would understand Him to mean that the invisible Ego who was then and there speaking was conscious that he was the same, identical Ego who had a conscious identity and existence, before Abraham. His hearers did so understand Him, and took up stones to stone Him, and if he was the natural son of Joseph they were right for it was the rankest kind of blasphemy, whether judged by the first or second commandments of the Decalogue or by the law laid down in the thirteenth or eighteenth chapters of Deuteronomy, the penalty of which was death by stoning.

The same rule applies when He said "I came down from Heaven," (John, chapter 6, verse 38), and to His saying, "Glorify Thou Me with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was," (John, chapter 17, verse 5).

And now will some of our Higher Critics give us any rational theory of how such an Ego could tabernacle in a human body, except the theory given by Matthew and Luke? Their only answer so far has been, "We are not certain that Jesus said those sayings. John is the only one who records them, and we are not certain that the Apostle John wrote the Gospel."

This is only jumping from one difficulty into another, and a greater one. For if Jesus did not utter them, when or where was the writer who lived and wrote before John's Gospel was written who was capable

of originating them to be put into His mouth, together with many other of His sayings?

We know something of the sayings or the alleged sayings, of other great religious leaders. Of Zoroaster, Gautama (Buddha), Confucius, Mahomet and even of Jos. Smith. We read of the wonderful miracles that their followers claimed they performed. But none of them claimed, nor have any of their followers claimed for them, that any of them said, "Before Abraham was I am," or that, "I came down from Heaven," or that, "I had a glory with the Father before the world was," or that any of them said, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst," or that any of them ever stood by a grave and said, "I am the resurrection and the life," or that any of them ever said to their followers, "All power in Heaven and in earth is given unto me. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, and lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

In the contention over the authorship of Shakespeare's plays, the only rational explanation yet offered is that Shakespeare wrote them. So the only rational explanation of Jesus' sayings, is that He uttered them.

And so we must admit that the rough policemen whom the rulers sent to arrest Jesus had a higher and clearer conception of spiritual things than have many of the graduates of our modern Theological Seminaries. For when they were asked, "Why did ye not bring Him?" answered, "Never man so spake" (R. V.) I have often thought those men spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. For they uttered a truth that will hold for all time. Never man so spake.

The Bible stands alone in human literature in its elevated conception of manhood as to character and conduct. It is the invaluable training-book of the world.—*H. W. Beecher.*

The advance in subscription of all subscribers for one year would lift our burden and insure our future. Do it now!

EDITOR'S WHAT NOT

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

A letter has been sent to every subscriber whose subscription expires in 1914, or earlier. If each will advance one year, our burden is lifted and our future is secure. The label on each Magazine indicates our account. "P" means, Patron, one who contributes money, of any amount, in addition to payment of subscription. "C" means, one who for other service in aid of our work receives a Complimentary copy. "S" means, one who for Special reasons, receives one or more copies for personal use or for distribution to win friends to the League. The figures, 12-14, or December, 1914, mean the date to which the subscription is paid. We earnestly solicit from each subscriber, aid in making this label correct, in spelling the name, in giving proper initials and degrees, in the address, and above all *in the date*. We have said repeatedly, we were so uncertain as to the dates in the beginning, we have continued all subscriptions until Dec. 1914, lest we should do some one an injury by discontinuing. We place the future in the hands of our Subscribers. An immediate response to the letters will make possible an immediate forward movement.

TO OUR PATRONS.

A letter will be sent during December to every Patron, who has ever aided us by contributions. We desire to secure pledges of any amount, to be payable any time within 1915. We seek to secure a minimum sum of \$300 a month. This will provide for the printing of THE CHAMPION, postage and incidentals. The moneys received from the subscriptions will provide what else may be needed for other expenses. The pledges in hand, run from \$5 to \$500. We suggest that in naming the amount, our Patrons state the date when we may depend upon it. The division of the contribution into smaller sums, in different months, will serve our purpose if preferred. We hope by this plan to see our way clear every month to pay the Printer, without delay or special effort. It

is safe to say that we have in sight one-half the amount needed. May we not earnestly urge an immediate response so that we may be able to plan a wide campaign throughout the whole country by means of THE BIBLE CHAMPION, and One Day Bible Conferences. A score of these could be opened immediately if we had the necessary funds.

THE HAGUE CRITIC.

We suggest that Critics, instead of being divided into "Higher and Lower," be divided into "Hague Critics"—*and the other kind*. The "Hague Critic" is the kind that conducts his campaign against the Bible according to the Hague Rules for War. Among the provisions of Article XXIII, it is prohibited, "To make improper use of a flag of truce, of the national flag, or of the military insignia and uniform of the enemy." In fact it is an order that combatants shall fight under their own flag and in their own uniform. What a revolution would be wrought if the Hague Rules should obtain in religion. Will it not be well to ask the critic when next you hear one getting ready to fire his opening gun: "Are you a 'Hague Critic'—or the other kind."

PROFESSOR TERRY AND THE PENTATEUCH.

When the Methodist Book Concern projected a Popular Commentary on the Old Testament a number of the most eminent writers in the Denomination were selected for the task. Prof. Newhall to whom was given Genesis and Exodus died and Dr. M. S. Terry was selected to fill his place. We know of nothing in print, brief, clear, scholarly, truer to Methodist standards than the Introduction to the Pentateuch. We select in this number a portion and will follow with two or three others. The average reader can find here the summary of the findings of the scholarship of the Evangelical Church. Nothing has occurred in the twenty-five years that invalidates a line or a word of this striking Introduction.

THE CRITICAL CONSCIENCE.

A wise man said, "Trust that man in nothing who has not a Conscience in everything." When Saul was ravaging the primitive Church he "thought he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus." His conscience "had vacation." When his eyes were opened, he never forgot, never excused, nor defended his crime. He declared that he was "not meet to be called an apostle, because he persecuted the Church of God." Byron, declared, "Man's conscience is the oracle of God." But bitterly he also sneered:

"Christians have burnt each other, quite persuaded
That all the Apostles would have done as they did."

We are beginning to believe that the only way to check the War now beginning seriously to threaten the Church of Christendom is to start a Prayer League to plead for "The oracle of God" to get busy. The leaders of the attack upon God's Word are not infidel as in other days. They are nearly all professed Christians, and most of them Christian Ministers, who have sworn to maintain the Scriptures, which they professed to "unfeignedly believe." "When conscience wakens, who can with her strive."

All effort is lost that is devoted to discussions of scholarship. The enemy "know it all"; they are endowed with a "divine discernment" that places them above all appeals, or argument. But even Achilles found "There was no armor against fate." So the enemy, "who can hear the Decalogue and feel no self-reproach," have their vulnerable spot. It is vital, even if, only in the heel.

Honor and loyalty have not changed meanings; neither have dishonor or disloyalty. Men in all ages, in all lands, in all conditions, however imbruted themselves, have within, a divine standard of honor and loyalty. They have ever believed:

"An open foe may prove a curse,
But a pretended friend is worse."

We have been reminded often that THE CHAMPION is unkind, cruel—even offensive, because it makes its chief point of

(Vol. xviii.—15.)

attack, Dishonor and Disloyalty. All remonstrances are accepted as evidence that our marksmanship is fairly accurate. We only say out loud, what all honorable men think. If you desire proof, ask the next man you meet what he thinks of the man who violates his solemn pledge taken with all the sanctity of an oath.

Science changes. It is only the day's record of what man has discovered of God's processes. "They are fresh every hour." Philosophy changes. Theology changes. Religion never changes. Honor and loyalty are basal principles of Religion. We can honor and respect the man, who changing his convictions, does not lose his honor, but pays the price manfully, however great. All men down deep in their hearts, despise and abhor the man, who pretending to have his eyes opened, refuses to go to his own, because it would involve loss of position, and money.

Have any of our readers ever known or heard of a man stepping down from a high place, casting aside all its privileges and perquisites because he has changed his views concerning the inspiration of the Bible? On the other hand; how many do you know, who have vitally changed their views, who do not hesitate to declare their new faith, and yet cling to the places they received because they were believed to be true and loyal? What is infinitely worse, they use the place with all its power and influence to delude and deceive those entrusted to their care, and if possible, win them to like treason. Do not send the names all at once. If we were to publish them, it would take several issues of THE CHAMPION.

We have stated again and again, what such treachery in secular interests or affairs, inevitably receives as its penalty. The War now raging across the sea, furnishes illustrations every day of the unvarying penalty for treason by the soldier. The severity of the punishment is not wholly because of the peril from treason, but is an expression of the indignation and horror of all honorable soldiers aroused by the despicable and dastardly crime. They think of the comrade by their side, in the

long vigil in the black night, who shares with them the watch-guard over their sleeping comrades; they think of the touch of the elbow of the comrade by their side in the deadly strife of war; they are haunted by the terror that either or both may be spies, traitors, dishonoring the uniform and only waiting for opportunity to bring defeat to the flag they salute. If these men are fierce and savage in giving treachery its just deserts, when only earthly honor and success are imperiled, what is due to the treachery that brings disaster to the Church of the Living God, and eternal ruin to multitudes of immortal souls? It is not our province to punish. God, in His own time and in His own way, will see to that. What we can do is to let all men know, and the traitor first, that honor and loyalty are not dead. That they who betray the Church of God are like him who betrayed the Son of Man.

"To say the truth, so Judas kiss'd his Master,
And cried 'All hail!' whereas he meant all harm." —*Shakespeare.*

WALK AWAY IN SILENCE.

"The silly, when deceived exclaim loudly; the fool complains; the honest man walks away in silence." If we are inclined to resent being deceived we need to remember, "We are never deceived; we deceive ourselves." That any intelligent, well-informed Christian could be deceived by the disguised infidelity that poses as the Modern Mind is a marvel. That the deceivers themselves believe what they teach is, if possible, even a greater marvel. Lowell in his "Fable for Critics" is not dealing with the theological ilk, but his keen blade of wit cuts that way, even with his back-stroke.

"They believed—faith, I'm puzzled—I think I may call
Their belief a believing in nothing at all."

The consensus of the world's scholarship for twenty centuries should count for something. The Evangelical Christian creed did not happen. It was forged in white heat through the ages and reached its finis after a struggle of such Titans as are

not known in these degenerate days. That all this could be overthrown by the resurrection of the fumings of discredited and dead infidels and proclaimed as the original findings of the Modern Mind is ridiculously absurd. The average mind imposed upon by wise looks and blatant boasting, too busy to examine, patiently listened and by silence seemed to give consent. Those who had time and inclination refused to cast away the creed of the centuries. They listened, and read and gave as their decision, all these "reasons are two grains of wheat hid in two bushels of chaff; you shall seek all day ere you find them; and when you have them, they are not worth the search."

When the apostle of the Modern Mind with gusto proclaims "Wellhausen, (or any other name of the tribe) represents the consensus of the universal scholarship of the world, don't laugh—if you can help it. Smile if you must—think of Cowper's *lilt*;

"Words learned by rote a parrot may rehearse,

But talking is not always to converse,
Not more distinct from harmony divine
The constant creaking of a country sign."

There never was any scholarship of the sort we have heard so much about. Those who have cared to dig among the rubbish of the infidel muckheap, report that most of the product of the self-styled Modern Mind is cribbed bodily from the Anaks, of Rationalism and Infidelity of the ages long ago. The Anaks, like the spider spun their web from within—and for the same purpose. The rebound has come. You can fool some Christians all the time—but not all of them any time.

We quoted in the June and August numbers of *THE CHAMPION* articles from the *Methodist Review* of such high character as to mark them the product of a great—but not Modern Mind.

These articles, from eminent and scholarly men were in proof of the position that the rebound from arrant disbelief to sanity of faith had come. In conclusion this was the summary:

"Destructive Criticism has once more

reached its limits and has dashed itself against the rocks. The natural result is a saner mode of dealing with the Bible and a firmer faith in its divine origin and its power to lead men nearer to God.

"Where are we to-day? We are not tossed by every wind of doctrine, but more firmly stationed upon the Rock of Ages. The conservative position is much stronger now than it was ten years ago. History repeats itself. As the Pietists of the seventeenth century and Wesley and his little band a century later, turned the swelling tide of rationalism and atheism in their day by preaching a simple, positive gospel, repentance and regeneration through the atoning blood of a divine Redeemer, so, too, in our day let there be a greater stress upon devout Bible study, conversion, implicit faith in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Then we, as the faithful in all ages, shall see the vagaries of the critics vanish like the morning mists before the healing rays of the Sun of Righteousness. Are not the great revivals of 1913 a prophecy of better days?

"Our little systems have their day;
They have their day and cease to be;
They are but broken lights of thee,
And thou, O Lord, art more than they."

Rev. Professor A. Lang, D.D., of Halle, Germany, on a recent visit to this country delivered several remarkable addresses. They appear in the *Reformed Church Review*, October, 1914. We quote a short extract to supplement the finding of *The Methodist Review*. It is entitled, *The Present State of Theological Thought in Germany*.

"Now that the Ritschian and Wellhausen schools, together with their successors, the modern theologians and the history of religion group, have come more and more into discredit, a favorable opportunity has arrived for the conservative or so-called 'Positive' Theology. Throughout the nineteenth century this theology has never failed; but it has worked quietly. As a result it has received far too little attention outside of Germany. The Positive Theology has also far less influence upon the newspapers and upon the

press in general, apart from those publications which it immediately controls. However it has developed an energetic activity, which in many instances, has led to more important results than those reached by its opponent. The latter itself ever returns to the former, to regain its bearings after the failure of each of its attempts to reconcile religion with the spirit of the times. The positive theology is ever in closer touch with the controlling orthodoxy of the Church as well as with the belief of the pietistic bodies. Its chief work is heretofore the maintaining and upbuilding of the Church, and, to this object it gives most of its adherents. It is still an unquestionable fact that most of the theological students of Germany receive their instruction from positive theologians. The modern positive theologians are convinced that the reconciliation between Christianity and the spirit of the times can be brought about only, as there is no modification of the ancient Christian faith, as witnessed in the creeds of the Church."

We advise our readers when the Modern Mind gets going and by rote rehearses what he has heard somebody say some other body had written, do not get excited and retort in kind; nor even sharply rebuke the imposition. *Walk Away in Silence*. Meditate upon the worldly wisdom of the *Car Advertiser*, who quotes Cowper at a distance by saying, "You can teach a Parrot anything, but he won't know what he is saying."

CONSPIRACY OR COINCIDENCE?

In the Council we offer brief reports of The War Against the Bible. In this instance it is the War in Methodism. Our readers are of all Evangelical denominations and vitally interested in the religious conditions in all. One striking fact is revealed by the plan and method of campaign. They are alike in all denominations and in all lands. The similarity is so striking that it inspires the query, "Is it a Conspiracy or a Coincidence?"

There are three stages of the campaign, which are clearly indicated in the War in Methodism. The first stage is good-na-

tured banter or humorous and jocular comment. There are three prominent Bible characters which become the first target for attack: Eve's Serpent, Balaam's Ass, and Jonah's Whale. They have been forced to become the stage property of Counterfeit Criticism from the beginning. Either of the three, in an emergency, is good for a joke, a column in a newspaper, or a learned article in a theological magazine. The decease of all three has been announced times without number. It may be doubted if any death has been reported oftener, save possibly, that of the grandmother, of the boy who was a base-ball fan. Infidelity has gone out of business. The assets of the firm have been taken possession of by the new firm which proposes to continue the business at the old stand, in the same line, but with a new name and more up-to-date methods.

The next move in the campaign is to slip men into places of influence and power, who may be counted on to conduct a quiet campaign. The places are Editors of important Periodicals, Professors in Colleges and Universities, Secretaries of Y. M. C. A., Pastors of leading Churches. These furnish articles for the press, issue books, deliver addresses, all of which are represented to be Evangelical Christianity interpreted in the spirit and words of the new age. Little can be selected to which serious objection can be made.

When sufficient public sentiment has been created, or sufficient support secured, to make the holding of the positions safe, the mask is thrown off. The assaults of ancient infidelity, stripped of blasphemy and vulgarity, are declared to be the assured results of the universal scholarship of the world. Those who do not follow their leadership, are Rip Van Winkles, back numbers, and to be pitied for their ignorance. The campaign becomes open, in the Sunday school, College, University, Theological school, Periodicals, through Books and Lectures, but always as Christians who love the Dear Old Book. They seek to free it from the things that hamper its usefulness and make it more perfectly reveal the Truth of God.

When they are criticized, or opposed they resent it with great heat and em-

phasis. They are affronted when reminded of their pledge of loyalty to the Church and its Articles of Religion and pose as the only *bona fide*, simon pure Evangelicals. The Denominational Press for fear of a bitter, or long continued discussion which will burden their pages, or through sympathy with the new faith close their columns to the remonstrants.

"What of it?" Many will ask. It is only necessary to ask another question in reply. What will be the result if for one generation this campaign is permitted to go on without rebuke, without protest, or without any action, save silence and discouraging controversy? The Graded Lessons in the Sunday school, will start the Sunday school children toward disbelief in the Bible as the Word of God and disregard for its authority. The young men and women in the schools and associations will accept the Bible as only one of the many valuable human books. The young ministers will discard the Articles of Religion while still posing as Evangelicals. They will preach and teach the new views and the faith of the Church will become unsettled. The Periodicals and Books claiming to teach the assured results of modern scholarship will complete the work. Evangelical Christianity will decline and suffer disaster. The Church will be driven to her knees in despair, and prayer and repentance will regain Divine favor and a Great Revival will sweep the Refuge of lies into oblivion as it has ever done. The Bible will shine with new luster. The Church will reach greater power and influence. But will any one dare count the number, *who having made ship-wreck of faith have drifted into irreligion and sin and will lose their souls?*

How shall this War be met? Not in kind, most assuredly. Our "weapons are not carnal, but are mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds." Prayer and appeal to God must be our chief weapons. We should decline to accept the battle-field selected by the enemy. We should refuse to discuss the issues as they present them. The vital issue is not scholarship but honor. Let the scholars on our side, and they are superior every way, in ability, piety, learning and numbers,

boldly face and combat the error. The average Christian has an easier, safer and surer way. Human affairs are based upon honesty, fair dealing and integrity. In no business, or profession or human relation, is honor dismissed as a negligible quality—but in religion. Ask the man of the street, what would happen if a Banker, Broker, Lawyer, Soldier, or any one of the multitude of employees of all grades and characters, were to violate a sacred trust and betray the interest committed to their care? If men hold inviolate their pledged word, even to their loss, through a high sense of honor, what can be said in defense of the Christian Minister or Teacher, who without scruple or apology scouts his pledges, although taken in the name of Religion and appealing to God for help? The most ignorant saint, even the child, who asks his Pastor or Teacher, if you break your word, may I break mine? offers an argument to which there can be no adequate, no honest reply.

Has not the time come for the Church of God to stop playing with the fire and dynamite and the germs of contagion? Can any Denomination continue the policy of silence and inaction without becoming an accomplice in the crime?

THE INTEGRITY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The article in our September issue on the above topic by Rev. William H. Bates, D.D., is of unusual value and interest. The author had several hundred copies printed, from our type, in pamphlet form. He is distributing them among leading scholars of all denominations. A limited number may be had for five cents a copy by addressing him at "The Plymouth," 1236 11th St., Washington, D. C. We give below a few of the complimentary personal notes the author has received.

A scholar, who is one of the very foremost men for literary skill and scholarly ability in the Baptist Denomination, writes:

"I feel pricked in conscience to the duty of telling you with what satisfaction I have just read you in the September BIBLE CHAMPION, on the 'Integrity of the Old Testament.' I cannot remember that I have ever read a controversial monograph

on any subject, that, in space so brief, more completely satisfied my sense of what was required,—this as to comprehension, as to lucidity, and as to tone. I thank you with all my heart. The little enlivements of wit and humor interspersed delighted me."

An eminent Baptist Evangelist writes:

"I have read with keenest interest your article. It is certainly fine and intensely fascinating. I was convulsed when I read your story of Prof. M'Realsham. I rejoice in the BIBLE CHAMPION, and such brethren as contribute thereto in defense of the faith."

An elderly lady a dear friend of boyhood days, wrote:

"I have always found 'The Bible Student' very interesting and instructive, but I have enjoyed this one, (September, 1914) more than any other I have seen. The subject you treat is one on which I feel deeply. It hurts like the wounding of a dear old friend to hear or see the bitter criticisms of the Bible that are sometimes expressed of late. I have found such inexpressible comfort in the dear old Book, over and over again, in sickness and sorrows, for many years, that I often feel the truth of the song:

"Thou truest friend man ever knew,
Thy constancy I've tried,
When all were false, I found thee true,
My counselor and guide."

"I rejoice that so many men of learning (you among the rest) are so ably defending the dear old Bible."

Great men in every department of learning have been students of the sacred Book. Sir Isaac Newton diligently studied the prophecies; Sir David Brewster was familiar with theological subjects; Faraday, the great chemist, expounded the Bible on Sundays in the meeting house of a small denomination; Sir Humphrey Davy was a reader of the Scriptures; and Gladstone was not only a Bible scholar, but took part in religious services on numerous occasions.

The advance in subscription of all subscribers for one year would lift our burden and insure our future. Do it now!

THE LIBRARY TABLE

A WORKING FAITH.*

All books on Theology may be tested by their attitude toward the Bible. If they are unsound in their treatment of the Scriptures, little else matters. We confine this review to as brief an examination as possible of the chapter on "The Bible and Faith."

A CHANGING FAITH.

"What is the place of the Bible in a working faith? A couple of generations ago that question would have been very simply answered: 'The Bible is the Word of God. What is in these pages, God has written. We are simply to take what is written here and believe it.' The answer is not so simple to-day. Nowhere has the change in traditional thought been so great. To multitudes the modern study of the Bible is confusing and disquieting. The foundations of faith are shaken."

The Methodist Episcopal Church has not changed its creed. No member is received into the Church who does not declare belief in "The Doctrines of the Holy Scriptures as set forth in the Articles of Religion." No man is admitted to the Ministry who does not declare "unfeigned belief in all the canonical Scriptures," and pledges himself "by the help of the Lord to drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word." Nothing renders this "confused and disquieted multitude" so ridiculous as to reveal its petty number by counting. The foundations of faith are neither shaken, shaking, nor shakable.

"We turn to the Old Testament. The scientist tells us that this story of creation does not agree with the record he reads in the rocks."

Which? The infidel or Christian scientist?

"The historian tells us that this picture of a flat earth and a solid, rounding firmament in which the sun and stars are fixed for the convenience of men, is simply taken from ancient stories of the East."

The "historian" is not named. There is

no such picture. As the Bible story antedates any of the ancient stories, it could hardly be copied from them. We will venture to name one historian whom the author doubtless overlooked. Ingersoll made his admirers roar and shriek (at 50 cents per) by jeers and jokes concerning the "solid firmament," and the "sun, two or three feet in diameter," that "could be stopped and pulled around like the sun and moon in a theater."

"The critic tells us that these first books are composed of different narratives which have been joined together, that some of these books were the growth of centuries."

The author reminds us of the attorney who closed his statement in defence of his client by asking for an immediate verdict of acquittal. The judge suggested that perhaps the case had better be tried and the testimony of the witnesses be heard before the verdict. The "critic" whom the author has in mind is the Counterfeit Critic. Sir Robert Anderson thus describes him: "True criticism enters upon its inquiries with an open mind, and pursues them without prejudice. The counterfeit aims to disprove the genuineness of the ancient writings. When putting the Pentateuch upon its trial, it begins with the verdict and then casts about to find the evidence." If the "critic" had been named, would it have been Astruc, the licentious debauchee who invented the documentary hypothesis? As we showed in Dr. Bates' striking article in the September CHAMPION, "he formed a connection with the most notorious woman of all Paris, the procuress of the court, and he maintained that illicit relation publicly for nineteen years, until her death." We do not wonder that his name was not mentioned in this connection. There never was a more transparent sham and delusion than this invention relating to the Pentateuch. Dr. Raven's article, beginning in this number of the CHAMPION, will give a quietus to the doubts of all thoughtful, unbiased readers.

"The student of religion points out how crude some of the religious thinking is

* By Harris Franklin Rall, Ph.D., D.D., President, and Professor of Systematic Theology, The Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Colorado

here, and how rude and even savage some of the ethics of such a book as *Judges*."

Ingersoll, after painting in lurid colors "the crude thinking" and "savage ethics" of the Bible, would dramatically call God "a monster and fiend." He would demand, "If there is any God, I pray Him to write in the Book of Eternal Remembrance opposite my name, that I denied that lie." His prayer was doubtless answered.

THE TRADITIONAL VIEW.

"The old conception of the Bible was perfectly simple. To have a true religion you must know about God. To know about God He must speak to us. The Bible is the book in which He thus speaks: thus God is its Author. Man could not have any real part in it, for then the human and imperfect would be there. Therefore it must be the literal and mechanical product of God. The men who wrote it were simply the 'pens of the Holy Spirit'; it was not their thought or spirit or experience that entered in, it was His dictation. If God is directly the Author of all, then all is equally true."

The author very cleverly mixes up a little truth with much of his own invention and produces a fable which he calls "the old conception of the Bible." The Bible nowhere declares that "God is directly the Author of all." That "man could not have any real part in it." That "the men who wrote it were simply the 'pens of the Holy Spirit.'" That the Bible "therefore must be the literal and mechanical product of God." This "mechanical conception of the inspiration of the Bible" is like the Documentary Hypothesis, a sheer invention. The exigencies of the case demand a theory of inspiration that can be jeered at and denied. The simple fact, observed by the most casual student of the Scriptures is, that no two books of the Bible are alike in style, expression or language. Each has its own individuality. If any two were alike we can easily imagine how the "critic" would chortle as he declared it. The writers, instead of being typewriting machines, are intelligent messengers, specially chosen because of their fitness, competence and veracity. They speak the truth given them, in their own words, and in accordance with their own personal characteristics. What

condition of mind makes it possible to call Moses, Isaiah, Daniel, or the Apostles, *machines!* The only claim the Church made and still holds is, *they were guarded against error in repeating the message delivered to them.*

THE MODERN VIEW.

"The modern Bible study begins with the same faith as the old: that God is in the writings, that here is a message for men. But it leaves the old theories to one side, and instead says: Let us look at these writings as they are. It is one thing to say that God comes to men: it is another to ask how He comes. The old theory without much regard to the Bible itself determined just how the Bible must have been written."

Here is another mix-up of a half-truth and a personal invention. The Church never had a "theory without much regard to the Bible itself to determine just how the Bible must have been written." That is the chief stage property of the "Critic." He is "wise above what is written," and without evidence or knowledge, with most marvelous cock-sureness, can "discern" the date, the author, the original story, the accretion from scribe, redactor and what not. It is laughably ridiculous when you merely state his maundering.

"To-day we are asking, with the modern scientific and realistic spirit, What is really here? What we have found as we have looked at these writings in this way is that we have here a human book. Here is no book dropped down from heaven, but something that has come up out of the life of the people."

It is difficult to take seriously the man who unhesitatingly and boldly assumes to be "bigger than God." If in this review we were to put into the author's book, statements the very opposite of what he has said, and justify the misrepresentation by declaring, "We are asking, with the modern scientific and realistic spirit, What is really here," we are sure the author would indignantly retort: "Quote my words exactly, fairly, truthfully." We are unable to understand how any writer has the audacity to take any book, much less the Holy Scriptures, and mutilate it by omission or excision, insertion or false quotation, and then

call it an exhibition of the "scientific" spirit. Science deals with facts, not with theories, inventions or untruths. We take the broad ground that no man is competent to pass judgment upon a superhuman book, unless he is a superman. The man who poses as qualified to discriminate between two Divine revelations and pass judgment upon them, favorable or unfavorable, is not a distant relation of the man who imagined that when he thought he heard God speak.

"We can no longer simply take word for word and say, Here is what God has written; believe this and do this No theory can make this book divine for us. No arguments are needed. Experience is the vital matter. The fact remains for our faith that he who comes with an open mind and reverent heart, who wills to do His will, shall find God here with his gift of mercy and of a new life."

The "critic," as Sir Robert Anderson has been quoted, does not "come with open mind and reverent heart." He comes with his mind already made up. He has decided as to the inspiration of the truth he reads before he reads it. No man ever found God after that fashion in His Word.

"We have misunderstood the Bible because we have started with the Bible, we have made a book the beginning of the Christian religion. Now, Mohammedanism is a book religion. It bases everything upon these words given to Mohammed from heaven. Mormonism is a book religion. It, too, claims to have begun with words dropped out of the sky. Christianity is not a book religion. Its fundamental fact for faith is not a book dropped from heaven, but a living God in His world, molding that world which He made, moving in history, coming into fellowship with men. First the deed, and then the word; first the history, and then the writing; first the living experience, and then the message. When we start with a book as our foundation, then we must have something finished, external, static, lifeless. And so we have the whole, mechanical, lifeless theory of the Bible."

We will dismiss Mohammedanism and Mormonism. They are evidently introduced to suggest indirectly that a human religion based upon fraud, delusion and falsehood

can be compared with a Divine Religion based upon a Divine Revelation. There can be no comparison, save between equals. "We have started with the Bible." How else can we start? Does a man accept, believe and obey the truth before he has been informed about it? Is there any other way to learn God's purposes, His will, His plans, His desires, His love, except in His Word? If so, then why do we fail to have a true religion anywhere, but where the Bible is? Again, an exigency demands a likeness between Christianity and Mohammedanism and Mormonism, and hence all are book religions. "First the deed, then the word." The deed is done because the word directs it. "First the history, then the writing." Men know no history save as it is already written. "First the living experience, then the message." Men who hear the message are taught how they may obtain the experience. If the logic of the author is correct, the Church has been guilty of supreme folly to send men to the heathen with the Book to win them to God. His whole argument is merely an attempt to meet the exigency of his theory by reversing the universal and uniform experience of the world from the beginning. If we accept him as our guide, we will only repeat the folly of the man who "set the cart before the horse." He learned by experience that it was not the better way.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE. . .

"What is the authority of this book for our faith? The old idea was very simple. These are so many words of God, which we are simply to accept and believe. It is not simply our better understanding of the Bible which prevents this, but our better understanding of faith. No merely external thing can be authority for us. To bow to a Church or a creed, or a book, is not Christian faith."

"No merely external thing can be authority for us." Try it on the policeman who detects you mutilating, destroying or stealing public property. His symbol of authority will be purely external—a badge, if he is in plain clothes—a club, if you are so foolish as to disobey or resist. To bow to a policeman, or a Judge, or a statute, mere external things like that, is the height of folly, when our inner consciousness acquits

us as within our rights. External authority would not argue the case, but would probably merely say, "Thirty days!"

It is only in Religion that men scout at the authority of "the external." "To bow to a Church—a creed—a Book is not faith." Substitute three words and make the sentence read, "To bow to the State, the Court, the Law!" Now the inner consciousness has a new light. The man will be fortunate if he is well advised and pleads guilty because he did not know any better. External authority may then say, "Acquitted because of ignorance—but don't do it again."

If we carry this a little further and substitute other words, so the sentence will read, "To bow to a Divine Revelation in a Book—to the organized Church of God to which I have voluntarily taken an oath of allegiance—to a God who has spoken in His Word and abides in His Church;" Now the inner consciousness is dumb, the sinner confesses guilt, pleads for pardon, pledges obedience. External authority declares lovingly and tenderly, "Thy sins are forgiven thee, go and sin no more."

"Only God Himself can be the final authority for our faith. Right here it is that the Scriptures gain their meaning for us, and in a real sense their authority. God comes to us through them. They are not only the great monument of His work in the world; they are the great avenue through which He still comes to men. Through them He commands our conscience, condemns our sins, stirs within us confidence, quickens within us the new life. The authority of the letter is gone."

"God comes to us through the Scriptures—they are the great avenue through which He still comes to men." Then Christianity is a book religion after all. There is no other avenue through which God may reach man and give him assurance that the message is Divine. Take away the Book and all it has taught us, and we are where the heathen are, without a Divine Revelation. They have no knowledge of God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit; of human life, its object, its destiny; of sin, and salvation; of Heaven and Hell. We have left nothing but illusions, such as made "The Golden Age" the most foolish, the most vicious, the most hopeless of all human history.

In the preface the author says: "History and Natural Science have given us a new world. Can we hold the old faith in the new world? That question these pages seek to answer." Asserting that the old faith needs re-statement and re-interpretation, he says: "These pages seek to give such a re-statement of faith. They seek to meet the difficulties which assail a thoughtful man to-day; to show that modern thought has brought not simply question, but enrichment; to set forth that faith in the speech of to-day; and to set it forth as a working faith that will meet the needs of real life and grow stronger through its experiences."

The single trouble with the Working Faith is, *it does not work*. It may be Modern—it is not Methodism. The Church has authorized no re-statement or re-interpretation. It cannot if it would. But it has in the most explicit manner forbidden any one in its communion to teach doctrines not in accordance with Evangelical Christianity and the standards of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Still it proclaims the Divine Message as her only answer to all the demands for new faiths to harmonize with the endless stream of new theories, social, scientific, and religious.

"Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls." (Jeremiah vi. 16.)

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

The Bibliotheca Sacra is to be congratulated upon its long and brilliant career. It has no superior in the character of the subjects treated, and for the intellectual ability and literary rank of its contributors. The Editor, G. Frederick Wright, LLD., alone is enough to make the Quarterly one of the foremost leaders of the world in the realm which has commanded the interest and labor of his whole life. **THE BIBLE CHAMPION** is not only highly honored, but greatly favored in name and under the direction of its new Board of Directors in being associated with *The Bibliotheca Sacra*. All new subscribers to the *Bibliotheca Sacra* may secure both Magazines for one year for \$3.00. This should be paid in advance and sent to **THE BIBLE CHAMPION**.

See page 233, for particulars of the \$3.00 Club rate of
THE BIBLE CHAMPION with the

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA
A RELIGIOUS AND SOCIOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

EDITOR

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

ASSOCIATED WITH

JAMES LINDSAY, CHARLES F. TWING, A. A. BERLE, WILLIAM E. BARTON,
HENRY A. STIMSON, HERBERT W. MAGOUN, AZARIAH S. ROOT,
MELVIN G. KYLE, W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

Never in all its history has the **BIBLIOTHECA SACRA** had a wider and abler set of contributors than it has at the present time. During the past year articles of great importance have appeared in it from the following eminent scholars: J. Dahse and E. F. König, of Germany; A. Troelstra, of Holland; J. S. Griffiths, J. Lindsay, G. Margoliouth, and H. M. Wiener, of Great Britain; E. M. Merrins, of China; S. C. Bartlett, of Japan; and W. H. G. Thomas, of Toronto (lately of Oxford). Among the American contributors should be mentioned Professors G. N. Boardman, of New York City (lately of Chicago Theological Seminary); G. Campbell, of Dartmouth College; A. M. Haggard, of Drake University; H. M. Haydn, of Western Reserve University; A. C. Knudson and H. C. Sheldon, of Boston University; M. G. Kyle, of Xenia Theological Seminary; and L. B. Wolfson, of Wisconsin University.

During the year 1913 Harold M. Wiener, Esq., continued his masterly defense of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, Professor A. A. Berle furnished a series of articles on "The Christian Church as a Social Instrument," and Dr. H. W. Magoun gave three papers on "A Layman's View of the Critical Theory."

Single Numbers, 75 cents

Yearly Subscriptions, \$3.00

THE BIBLE CHAMPION, 10 cents; Yearly Subscription \$1.00

Address,

BIBLE LEAGUE, 317 EAST 118th ST. NEW YORK CITY

EGYPT TO CANAAN

Or, Lectures on the Spiritual Meanings of the Exodus

BY REV. A. H. TUTTLE, D.D.

Size, 12mo (5 x 7¾ inches). Pages, 286. Binding, cloth.

PRICE, NET, \$1.00

"Of the many volumes that have made this particular period of Israel's history the subject of spiritual exposition and application, this is one of the best. It takes the narrative as it stands, and draws most helpful, intellectual, and spiritual lessons for daily life. The treatment is masculine, free from undue 'spiritualizing' and marked by not a little able expository work. Altogether it is a book to be read and pondered by preachers and hearers." — *The Sunday School Times*.

"It gives a vivid bird's-eye view of Egypt at the time of the Exodus, with its teeming industry, its magnificent art, its intellectual culture, its stimulating pleasure, and the magnificence of its religion. Everything is living and pictorial, and the lessons of the story are forcibly put." — *The London Quarterly*

"Such thinking . . . is good tonic. The author knows how to interpret the deep things of the Word so as to attract and instruct." — *Zion's Herald*.

"The volume teaches the spiritual meanings of the Exodus with unusual force and freshness." — *The Expository Times*.

"For clean and keen insight into moral values, for interpretation that gets close to the heart of things, and all in a style luminous, apt and compelling, the Doctor's latest volume cannot be too strongly recommended." — *Christian Advocate*.

"This volume of sermons breathing the rich fragrance of spiritual truth contains a much needed message. It will help to strengthen the life that is hi with Christ in God. Even Edinburgh would delight in preaching like this—meaty, savory, nutritious, full of the Bread of Life and the Water of Life." — *Methodist Review*.

Address,

BIBLE LEAGUE, 317 EAST 118th ST. **NEW YORK CITY**

WORKS BY DR. L. W. MUNHALL.

The Highest Critics vs. The Higher Critics

Ninth Edition.

"Packed with strong statement, apt quotation and Scriptural references. There is a freshness and vigor of style which betoken the ready speaker. There is an adroitness and a directness of argument which indicate one accustomed to the use of his tools and his material. As a devout tribute to the Word of God, this book of this efficient evangelist is admirable."—*The Christian Advocate, New York.*

CLOTH, 249 PP., \$1.00, POSTPAID.

The Lord's Return and Kindred Truth

Ninth Edition.

"Dr. Munhall writes with great sobriety and much more logic than many writers on prophetical Scriptures."—*New York Observer.*

"It is certainly an able presentation."—*The Interior.*

"We know of no work better suited to place in the hands of one who has not made up his mind upon this most important topic."—*Episcopal Recorder.*

CLOTH, 224 PP., \$1.00, POSTPAID.

The Convert and His Relations

Third Edition.

"He dwells particularly on the young convert's relations to Christ in four chapters; to the Holy Spirit in three chapters; his relations to the Church, the Bible, the world, two chapters; to the work and to the future. There is no cant in the book, no cheapening of religious responsibility and demand, and no softening down to the world, and no satisfaction with anything short of a personal attachment to Christ and a thorough devotion of the whole life to His service. Such a book braces one up. It can be given to almost any sort of a Christian, with a comforting expectation that it will do him good. It has Bible in it, and good human sense and backbone. Indeed, it reminds one of the sound Gospel evangelist, Dr. Munhall himself, for whom, though a personal stranger, we have very high respect."—*Christian Intelligencer.*

CLOTH, 208 PP., \$1.00, POSTPAID.

Furnishing for Workers

Nearly 190,000 of these have been sold.

A prominent lawyer said of it:—"I would not take five hundred dollars for the copy I have, if I could not get another."

"Just the book to carry in the pocket, giving at a bird's-eye glance the passages of Scripture needed to meet an almost endless series of questions, objections, etc., which we constantly hear."—*Book Record, New York.*

LEATHER, 118 PP., 25 CENTS, POSTPAID.

Just Issued.

BREAKERS!

Methodism Adrift.

CLOTH, 216 PP., \$1.00, POSTPAID.

Address,

317 EAST 118th ST.

BIBLE LEAGUE
NEW YORK CITY

BIBLE LEAGUE,

WORKS BY PROF. R. F. WEIDNER, D. D., LL.D.

PROFESSOR OF DOGMATICS, CHICAGO LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, AT MAYWOOD, ILL.

STUDIES IN THE BOOK. New Testament Series, three volumes.

Vol. 1. *Gospels, Acts, Seven General Epistles, and Revelation.*

Vol. 2. *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul.*

Vol. 3. *Later Epistles of St. Paul.*

Old Testament Series.

Vol. 1. *Genesis.*

Vol. 2. *Exodus.*

Each Volume, Price 50 cents, Postage 4 cents.

"Those familiar with Professor Weidner's mode of teaching in the summer schools know something of the vigor and terseness of his mode of presenting the truth."—*The Standard.*

"Of the various plans designed to interest the public in Bible study after a scientific method, these books are by far the best we know of."—*N. W. Christian Advocate.*

"His treatment of the higher critical use of the Pentateuch is full, simple, sensible, and on the whole, the most satisfactory statement of the subject in its present aspects that we have yet seen. The amount of pertinent fact and information, of such nature and in such a form as the student desires, which Dr. Weidner has placed within a small compass of his work on Genesis, is really wonderful."

THEOLOGICAL ENCYCLOPAEDIA AND METHODOLOGY. 2 vols. Price \$1.50 each, Postage 10 cents a volume.

"The books bring down to date the very best that is known concerning Exegetical, Historical, Systematic and Practical Theology, modernizing the volumes so long favorably known. The excellencies are too numerous to be mentioned in a brief review. Not only is there a valuable bibliography at the end of the sections on each division and subdivision of the enormous subjects with which the book deals, but at the end of volume 2 is given 'A select pastor's library' costing \$300 and another costing \$1,000. We are sure that this feature will appeal to many ministers; for the books are wisely chosen and the minister who purchases and studies them will not only have a select Theological library but will be himself a select pastor."—*Christian Intelligencer.*

CHRISTIAN ETHICS. Based on Martensen and Harless. 418 pages, Price \$1.50 Postage 16 cents.

"It is not only a very readable, but a singularly interesting volume, and fully merits the judgment which we heard fall from the lips of our venerable Professor of Ethics (Dr. Mann), that it is the best work in that department which America has produced."—*Dr. Jacobs in the Lutheran Church Review.*

WORKS ON DOGMATICS

INTRODUCTION TO DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. Second revised edition, Pages 289

Price \$2.00, Postage 12 cents.

"There is so much matter, of so great excellence, concerning subjects of so great importance, assembled in this volume, that all interested in the subject of Dogmatics will find it well worthy of study."

"This work presents within moderate compass what one would be obliged to seek for otherwise through whole libraries."—*The Standard.*

THEOLOGIA, OR THE DOCTRINE OF GOD. 1905. Price \$1.00.

THE DOCTRINE OF MAN. Pages 199. Price \$1.00.

"I have so thoroughly enjoyed examining the book that I desire personally to express my very great pleasure in the careful methods you have employed and the grand conclusions you have reached. The book stands in grand contrast with so much now being done in the study of Man that it is very refreshing, and deserves a wide reading."—*Dr. Beardslee, Western Theological Seminary, Reformed Church in America.*

CHRISTOLOGY, OR THE DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON OF JESUS CHRIST.

Pages 222. 1913. Price \$1.00.

SOTERIOLOGY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE WORK OF JESUS CHRIST. In

press. Price \$1.00.

DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH. 1903. Price \$1.00.

DOCTRINE OF THE MINISTRY. 1907. Price \$1.00.

Postage on all works of Dogmatics selling at \$1.00, 8 cents each.

Address,

BIBLE LEAGUE,
1115 BROADWAY

317 EAST 118th ST.

NEW YORK CITY

